[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]
takes care of the future of these countries after the war so that a durable peace prevails not only in the Middle-East but all over the world. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the Gulf situation will be resumed at lunch at 2.30.

The House stands adjourned for lunch.

The House then adjourned for lunch at three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY) in the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING 25TH FEBRUARY 1991

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFIARS (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business during the week commencing 25th February, 1991, will consist of:

(1) Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.

(2) Discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

DISCUSSION ON GULF WAR—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.A BABY): Shri M. S. Lather.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISRY OF FINANCE AND THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH): I have to give one clarification. Mr. P. Shiv Shanker said that India's permanent Representative to the UN, Mr Gare Khen has said that it is a UN war. As a matter of fact, the Indian representative to the Security Council, has said something contrary. He said that it is not a UN war. I would like that the statement should be expunged from the proceedings of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): This is an observation made by a Member. So, as soon as this is clarified, that is contradicted.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: However, it is good that it is contradicted now. It should have been done earlier. In any case both the versions will be there. You cannot expunge it for that reason.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: Whatever be the procedure, I am not particular about expunging. Whatever I have put forward is the fact and the record should be corrected.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: (Bihar): Mr. Shiv Shanker's statement, whatever he observed, should be treated as reported. His observations were on the basis of the press reports. Now, we take note of the Government's clarification that this is the statement of facts.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): That forms part of the record. Now, Shri Sukomal Sen.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER (Haryana): Sir, you had called me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): It was by mistake.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): many of us were led to believe that imperialism had changed its character, and it is no more belligerent and predatory. But, the Gulf War must have disillusioned us by now of those beliefs. Sir, the United States and the Allies managed to hijack the United Nations and have come down heavily on a very small, third-world nation, Iraq and now they are out to

destroy that country. Sir, at the same time, while the United States and the Allies are engaged in such a treacherous warfare in the Arab, region against Iraq, we find that an equally unprecedented anti-war movement is sweeping the world, over, whether it is Europe or America, or other countries like even India.

This type of an anti-war movement ,this type of peace movement, was never witnessed since the last ten or twenty years. So, we are seeing a very serious situation in the international arena today. So, when we are facing such a situation, what is the role that the Government of India plays? That is what we are concerned with now.

I feel that never in the history of the country has the foreign policy of the Government bungled so much as it has done in the case of Gulf war. We have agonisingly noted that in the present war. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, on a point of clarification ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What is the clarification?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Sir, I just want to seek a clarification ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You first take the permission of the Chair .... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR I have nothing against what Mr. Sen has said. I just want to have a clarification from the Minister. He is here now and he will go to the other House afterwards ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You cannot take the House for granted as you have taken the Government for granted .. (*Interruptions*)... You cannot dictate to the House. You can dictate to the Government, not to the House ..... (*Interruptions*)... Sir, it is very odd that when a Member is speaking, suddenly somebody rises and starts speaking without the permission of the Chair... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am not entering into any controversy with you, least of all with you. I will keep silent even if you provoke me. Even if you provoke me, I do not want to be provoked... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, what seems to be happening is that the Minister made some clarification and Mr. Fotedar wants to seek clarification on that.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am seeking a clarification on the statement made by the Minister and I have nothing against what Mr. Sukomal Sen has said... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICS-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): That I can allow only if that Member yields.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: It is because the Minister has made a clarification.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, this will set a bad precedent... (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): He is not yielding... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): You see, Mr. Sen is not yielding.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am just seeking the indulgence of the Chair... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, this will set a bad precedent. One Member is speaking and another is suddenly seeking a clarification. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am not seeking any clarification from you. You speak whatever you want to speak. I want the clarification from the Minister.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Then you wait for some time.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You were absent at that time and now you want a clarification ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Suddenly you want a clarification ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I have come just now and somebody told me that the Minister made a statement. I want a small clarification on that. That is all... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Can't you people wait for two minutes so that he can have his clarification from the Minister?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Mr. Sen, it is only two sentences and you will be satisfied. Just two sentences only.

Sir, I was told that the honourable Minister for Petroleum and Chemicals made a statement in this House that India's Representative, Mr. Ghare Khan, has not made any statement in the United Nations or in Washington or New York as was mentioned by the leader of the Congress (I), Mr. P. Shiv Shanker... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): It was not made by Mr. Malaviya, but by Mr. Digvijay Singh.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Whatever it is, I want to tell the hon. Minister, Mr. Digvijay Singh that this new war telecast at 9.30 p.m.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: I have gone through the record. The All India Radio has given a different version.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am not saying All India Radio. I am saying Television. The TV report on the 18th or the 19th of January, after the 17th January ... (*Interruptions*) India's Permanent Representative has said that what ....

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What is going on here. Both the things have gone on record. Nothing has been expunged, and the people will understand

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I am just asking whether the settlement was broadcast on the Delhi TV on the 18th or 19th January this year that India's Representative has said that it is not the United States but it is the United Nations which is fighting the war in the Gulf. On the 27th or 28th of January the Secretary-General of the United Nations said that it is not the United Nations but it is the United States which is ....

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: I may again put it on record. I am not here for the news, but I am saying that the United Nations Permanent Representative has said that this is not a U.N. war. That's all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M A. BABY): Now the matter is cloesd. Mr. Sukmal Sen.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Whatever may be the clraifications, but in this entire coure of the world we have been nothing that the sympathies of this Government lie not with the Third World country Iraq, which has been destroyed but with the United States and its allies. That is a fact.

Sir, the fact is that Iraq occupied Kuwait. Nobody will support this. Nobody supported it. My party did not support it. But there is also the background. I am not going into this. In 1961 Kuwait was formed by the Britishers. Iraq objected. In the Security Council Soviet Union vetoed the Resolution seeking recognition to Kuwait. All these things are there.

Thereafter in 1963 Iraq recognized Kuwait. It is a past history. And thereafter, in the recent past, Kuwait played a second fiddle to the United States and they brought down the price of crude oil. All these things are there. I am not going into these things, in past history. But occupation of Kuwait cannot be supported. But the United States now is shedding crocodile tears to liberate Kuwait. The war is going on. As if it the moral duty of the United States to liberate Kuwait, since Iraq has subjugated Kuwait.

Sir, on this point my predecessor and other speakers have elaborated. What is the credibility of the United States? To that I am coming later on. In the earlier years the United States invaded various countries, whether Panama and others or supporting the apartheid regime of South Africa, getting Mr. Mandela arrested. But this time they have got the stamp of approval of the United Nations. This is what has benefited the United States. Previously it did not happen. And the manner in which the United States has managed to get the Security Council Resolution endorsed... (*Interruptions*) It is not that the war is being conducted by the United Nations. Seeing the manner in which the Resolution was got endorsed, it is my view that the whole credibility of the United Nations has gone down. Now it can be hijacked by anybody. Sir, I feel that there was a particular reason for the United States to wage a war, because in the present state the United States needed a war. For what? The American economy was undergoing a serious recession. The world economic survey says that America was suffering from a recession, and they wanted to tide over the recession. And for that they wanted a war, because by a war some boost would be given to the military industrial complex of the United States. They wanted a war.

Secondly, Sir, I am definitely of the view that since the Second World War and the Vietnam War the United States and their allies invented a number of high-tech weapons and they could not get a chance to put them to a practical test. And, perhaps, Iraq, a third world country, has become a very suitable arena for them to test those new hi-tech weapons, and they are testing them. Sir, if you go through the newspapers, you will find that when the Patriot missile is being fired, the Company which manufactured the Patriot missiles are now finding out the defects and they are trying to rectify the defects so that they make it fool-proof. The laser bomb was used to destroy that civilian air-raid shelter where 2,000 women and children were massacred. Sir, I remember, at the end of the Second World War, when the war was going to be concluded, when Germany had already surrendered and Japan was going to surrender, at that time, America bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima with atomic weapons. What was the necessity? There was no necessity. It was only to tell the people that new weapons have been invented and how they act, and also to threaten the Soviet Union that they have these weapons. That was the purpose of the imperialist powers. Similarly, Sir, when the laser bomb was used to bomb down the air-raid shelter, going deep into 7 or 8 feet concrete bunker, the newspapers said that the American military experts are glad that the laser bomb has been a successful weapon which can penetrate a bunker covered with 7 to 8 feet concrete wall. So, it is a test. A test on what? It is a test on innocent Iraqi children and women. This is how imperialism wanted the war. They needed a war. And Saddam Hussein by his unwise action has given an opportunity to the United States to come to the Arab region and start the war. He has provided them an opportunity. But, Sir, I never believe, I refuse to believe that this war is conducted to liberate Kuwait. This is to establish their neo-colonial domination. Sir, after the Second

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

World War, particularly in 60s, the European countries, the Anglo-French imperialists, and the Americans had to leave the Arab world because of the rising Arab nationalism. Arab nationalism fought against Anglo-French imperialism and the American imperialism. And those imperialist countries had to vacate the Arab world. But despite vacating the Arab world, they tried to pamper some Sheikhdoms. Kuwait is one of them. Who rules Kuwait? Iraq is not ruled by a Sheikhdom. It may be a military-commander rule. But it is a secular rule. It is not at least a Sheikhdom. But Kuwait is a Sheikhdom. Kuwait is ruled by a Sheikhdom. That Sheikhdom was established by the British in 1961. Sir, you know the history of Egypt, you know the history of Syria. You know how after Nasser the change had taken place, how the previous Egyptian Government has been manipulated, and how they have been drawn to the lap of the American imperialists. So, after vacating the Arab region, America, instead of trying to leave it, for neo-colonian domination, tried to capture the Government but failed to capture the Arab people. They tried to capture the Arab Governments, they pampered them, helped them and armed them and encouraged them to fight among themselves. So unfortunately, in this war, Arab Governments are divided. I don't say that Arab people are divided. Sir, look at the newspapers. We see that every day, in almost all Arab countries, thousands of people are domonstrating against the American imperialism and in support of Iraq. But, unfortunately, the Sheikhdom of Saudi Arabia, the reactionary Government of Egypt and the Syrian Government, because of their rivalry with Saddam Hussein who, they fear, will dominate over the Arab world, and despite the reluctance of their own people, joined the American camp. Some of the Arab Governments joined the American camp and they are conducting war against Iraq. This is the scenario in the whole Arab region.

And, Sir, what is the role of India in this regard? Sir, India is a Non-aligned country. From the very start, it has fought against imperialism. It has fought against neo-colonial domination. This is the corner-stone of Non-alignment movement. It is not a principle of any particular Government. This principle has been evolved as an aftermath of the national struggle, freedom struggle. And this principle has been accepted by the people as a whole. It is not the policy of a particular Government. This is the policy of the entire nation. Sir, the United States is for neo-colonial domination and for control of the oil fields. Bush is on record saying that "we cannot leave Gulf because it will affect our American way of life." What is the American way of life? Without oil they cannot live. And Sir, you know that America has enough oil reserves but they do not extract that oil. They want to reserve it for future use. They want to take oil from the Arab countries and to control the entire oil-fields, to control oil prices because the oil is so vital for American civilization, for American comfort and luxury, without which they cannot continue. So they want domination of the entire region. Perhaps, Saddam Hussein was an obstacle to that desire, to their ambition. Now, Sir, what is Mr. Bush saying? Mr. Bush is saying not only of the liberation of Kuwait he is on record. Saying it and all newspapers have reported it—he wants to see the dead body of Saddam Hussein. He wants to see Saddam Hussein dead. That is what Mr. Bush is saying. What a personal vendetta, what a personal revenge nurtured against Saddam! He feels that Saddam is a Third World country leader and he is the President of United States and Saddam had defied him. So he wants to see the dead body of Saddam. Such a macabre desire has never been expressed by any political leader of any country. It is only Bush who says "I want to see the dead body of Saddam Hussein". It clearly indicates

that this is not a war for liberation of Kuwait but it is a war for domination of the entire Arab world. Some of the Arab allies who have joined them, have done so only to protect their own reationary set-up and to protect their own alliances with American imperialism for their own self-interest and not for the interest of the people. They are betraying the Arab interest, they are betraying the Arab nationalism.

Now, Sir, I come to Indian Government's role. Really, I am sorry to see the role of the Indian Government from the very start, from the day the war started. In early hours on 17th January America started bombing Baghdad. What did the Government do since the war started? Sir, for two weeks Government kept sleeping. India is a country which championed the entire non-alinged movement . It conducted anti-imperealist stir. And even Indira Gandhi is on record saying that non-aligned movement is the biggest anti-imperialist struggle of the world. So this is the character of our non-aligned movement. What was our Government doing? The Indian people were feeling very much agonised. Demonestrations were conducted in Delhi, Calcutta and elsewhere against American invasion of Kuwait. Indian Government, the Delhi Administration put a ban on demonstration in Delhi in front of American Embassy. They were reluctant to see demonstration in front of American Embassy. This is what Indian Government did and they kept sleeping. When there was a public outcry that Indian Government should act, it cannot remain silent, it cannot sleep, then only they tried to contact Belgrade, the NAM Headquarters and some sort of meeting was arranged there. What a mockery, Sir! When Baghdad was being bombed and pulverised, when it was being reduced to dust, when innocent people were being killed, children and women were being killed, even the factories were bombed, when hospitals and schools were bombed, when people were dying, at that time Mr. Chandra Shekhar our great Prime Minister was sending a letter to President Saddam Hussein to vacate Kuwait without uttering a single word condemning the American bombing. Huge explosives were used on Baghdad and other cities of Iraq. Sir, the experts say that the explosive power of those bombs was much more then the two atomic bombs that were thrown on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. It is what the experts say. So, when these things were going on, our Prime Minister did not say a single word in condemnation of this barbaric act on Iraq. On the contrary, our Foreign Minister is on record, and Prime Minister is on record saying, that no, no, Iraq should vacate Kuwait. Iraq is to vacate Kuwait; there are no two opinions on that; but at the same time who has given the right to the United States and its allies to destroy Iraq? Government of India kept silent over this matter. Even when Saddam Hussein's radio broadcast in Baghdad appealed to the Third World countries saying that a Third World country was being pulverised, and appealed to other countries to raise their voice against American imperialism, our Indian Government which is supposed to play a non-aligned and anti-imperialist role, kept silent. As I said, Government's sympathy lay with American imperialism, and not with a Third World country like Iraq. This is what has been happening.

Take the U.N. Resolution No. 660. The Resolution does not give the right to the United States and its allies to

[Shri Sukomal sen]

completely destroy Iraq, to destroy the economic infrastructure of Iraq, to destroy its schools, hospitals and to kill women and children or to completely destroy the military hardware of Iraq. I need not read out the text of this Resolution. The Resolution only says use of all means to vacate the aggression on Kuwait. It never said that they can completely destroy a nation, eliminate it or annihilate it. But a genocidal bombing is being resorted to, and not a word of condemnation has come from Mr. Chandra Shekhar's Government. Later, when the Defence Secretary of Bush Administration said that use of nuclear weapons is not ruled out, even then nothing came out of this Government's mouth. But when there was a public outcry in India and elsewhere, and when there were massive anti-war demonstrations in India and elsewhere, only at that time, under pressure, the Prime Minister came out saying that people should not talk of nuclear arms. But has this Government tried to stop American imperialism from trying to destroy that country? It is the black-malling tactics of American imperialism which has subdued our Government from raising its voice against destruction of that country. Our country's Prime Minister does not say a single word against it. Now, what has our Government done? Our Foreign Minister went to Belgrade. But who was our Foreign Minister? It was Mr. V. C. Shukla, a disqualified Member of the Lok Sabha who was going as the Foreign Minister to visit Belgrade, for conducting negotiations. But who will take him seriously when our own countrymen do not take that gentleman seriously? Why should other countries take him seriously in Baghdad or Belgrade and listen to him? But he was being sent there. Even now, you see the mockery of it. Now, a team of the Foreign Ministers of NAM countries are visiting Baghdad. I do not know what will they do now after so much of destructions has already taken place. And see who is accompanying that team from India? It is Mr. Digvijay Singh, our Deputy Minister who will be accompanying that team. Sir, it is really serious. At least a senior Cabinet Minister could go to accompany that delegation. It is not only devaluing the delegation, but it is rather derogatory to India. Can't a senior full-fledged Cabinet Minister accompany this delegation to Baghdad? This shows how casually the Government has taken this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a casual Government.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Now I come to refuelling question. The newspapers gave the news that refuelling facilities were being given to US war planes at Sahar airport. Some news was that it was being done in Madras and other places also, and some Naval boats had also come. It is, perhaps, the most shameful performance of our Government. Even two days back, US war planes were allowed refuelling in Sahar airport, and when there was a public outcry and protest throughout the country, and almost all the political parties protested—some of them in a forthright manner—and they demanded that it should be stopped immediately, no action has been taken. This, in fact, amounted to compromising with our non-alignment policy and our anti-imperialist policy. And our Prime Minister had said that it had already been going on since long and that it was based on friendly relations between our two countries. He said If people do not want, we will stop it". When almost all the political parties demanded the stopping of it, then what is the meaning when he says "if all the political parties say, then I will stop"? Even then, Shri Chandra Shekhar did not stop it. There was a statement which came out in the newspapers that Shri Chandra Shekhar has said that refuelling has been stopped. Nevertheless, newspapers came out with the photographs of the US airplanes taking fuel from Sahar airport which means that this has not been stopped. When the Government was not in a position to ask the United States that

3 P.M,

their planes should not come and that they will not allow refuelling, the U.S. Government themselves came to their rescue and said, "we are stopping refuelling at Sahar airport. We will not send our planes to India and we will find out some other place". Why is this surrender to American imperialism?

Our Finance Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, is here. Is it for the reason that the Government of India has contracted a huge amount of IMF loan and is contemplating to get another loan from them? Is it one of the conditions that India should not utter a single word against America in respect of war in the Gulf or should not utter a single word about the refuelling in Sahar airport?

Now about the Congress Party. Their spokesman came out saying they criticised refuelling. At the same time they said that it was done during the time of Shri V. P. Singh. I do not know since when it has been continuing; whether from Shri Rajiv Gandhi's time or Shri V. P. Singh's time or from the subsequent times. Government should come out with fact as to when this so-called bilateral arrangement has been continuing between India and the United States.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Shri Chandra Shekhar has said that it has been continuing for the last 21 years.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: The Prime Minister has said that it is not an agreement. It is simply an executive order. Then he said that it has been continuing for the last 21 years. But the V. P. Singh Government has functioned for less than one year. It was installed in November 1989, then it fell in November 1990, that is, just 11 months. So, if refuelling has been continuing for the last 21 years, what was the purpose of the Congress spokesman to create a smoke-screen saying that it has been continuing since Shri V.P. Singh's time and that he had given the order? Government should come out with facts. What happened when the war started? When the war started, the situation entirely changed. At that time, allowing the the refuelling means allowing India to be aligned with a particular party in that warfare; it means, aligning India with American imperialism. This miniscule Government supported by the biggest political outfit of the country has sacrificed our non-alignment policy which has been created since Independence, and it has supported to US attack against a Third World country. This is the most shameful and sordid performance of this Government. Has the Government the right to exist? This Government has no right to exist after the sordid performance after this big sell-out of the principle of non-alignment and the principle of anti-imperialism that cherished since our freedom struggle. This Government must go immediately. If this Government remain even for a day, they will further compromise our principles. Perhaps the country's sovereignty and independence is also compromised.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): You supported the V. P. Singh Government at that time... (*Interruptions*). What was your stand at that time?
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN (Kerala): You ask Mr. Malaviya. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: What are your views? You supported that Government. You must clarify your position. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Hang Mr. V. P. Singh. Hang Mr. Chandra Shekhar. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I understand the agony of Mr. Jagesh Desai. They are supporting a Government which has been caught on the wrong foot. That is why they are agitated. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: We fully agree with you. But what is your stand? You supported the V. P. Singh Government, which also did this.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You withdraw your support to this Government, which has compromised on principles and which has devalued the foreign policy. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: You extended support to that Government at that time. What are your views? You never spoke a single wort. You have no right to ask us. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Mr. Sen, please conclude. There is aonther speaker from your Party.

SHRI SUKHOMAL SEN: I am concluding. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Desai, you are supporting a Government which has sold the foreign policy.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: The same thing was done by the V. P. Singh Government. It was against the policy of the Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is on record. (*Interruptions*) During the Vietnam War, a U.S. warship was allowed to come to the Cochin Port. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Chandra Shekhar has said that this has been going on for the last twenty-one years. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: It has not happened before. We criticised this. But what is your Party's views? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Even day-before-yesterday, Mr. Chandra Shekhar has said that this was being done for the last twenty-one years.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I am talking about the air corridor.

SHRI SUKHOMAL SEN: Sir, there is another shameful thing. On the 2nd August, Iraq occupied Kuwait. On the 12th August, Iraq said that the issue of Kuwait occupation should be linked to the Israeli occupation of Palestine. At that time, the Government of India spokesman, the disqualified Foreign Minister himself, came out openly that these two issues cannot be linked. The Prime Minister also said the same thing. The question is, what is the Government's policy on Palestine? Our Party's stand has been very clear from the beginning.

The Palestine problem has been there for the last forty-three years. The Kuwaiti problem is there only from the 2nd August last year. What has been our policy? To support the liberation struggle of the Palestinians and to get the Israelis to vacate the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. We have recognised the PLO. We have recognised the PLO Government in exile. They have that embassy in Delhi. We have political and diplomatic relations with them.

Of course, the United Nations passed a Resolution asking Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait But I would like to remind the House that the same United Nations passed a host of Resolutions asking Israel to vacate the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and to negotiate with the PLO. There have been a number of Resolutions. The United Nations passed a number of Resolutions on Cyprus asking Turkey not to meddle in the affairs of Cyprus. As you know, Turkey suddenly entered Cyprus, walked into Cyprus, and occupied a part of it. These are facts of history.

Mr. Saddam Hussein said that he would vacate Quwait. At the same time, he wanted that Israel should vacate the Palestinian territory. The Government of India should have supported this stand of Iraq. We should have said that this was also an issue. Anybody who has a little knowledge about the Arab world knows that peace in West Asia cannot be guaranteed without setting the Palestinian problem. There can be no durable peace if the Palestinian issue remains unresolved. Today,

Iraq may vacate Kuwait, but Israel will remain in Palestine. This will be a perpetual source of conflict and bloodshed in the entire region. It would mean that one nation will continue to be subdued by another nation merely because it is powerful and it is supported by American imperialism. It cannot be tolerated. But in that respect the Government of India did not utter a single word. On the contrary, they condemned linkage of Kuwait problem with Israel. The Government of India deviated blatently from the principle of supporting Palestinian liberation struggle in support of Palestinan people, against Israel occupation. These are the facts of history and the Government of India has acted very shamefully in a sordid manner, betraying all the principles of non-alignment and betraying the cherished goals of the Indian people.

Now we have seen what is happening. Soviet Union is taking peace initiative. If we were to believe the radio, even the Soviet Union is agreeing to the linkage of the Palestinian issue in a certain way. Perhaps, not in the way Saddam wanted, but in a different way. In the total package of peace proposal even the Soviet Union has explaied that after the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and withdrawal of foreign troops from Arab region, there should be a West Asian Conference to settle West Asian problem, including the Palestine problem. Without touching Palestine how can you establish peace in the Arab region?

Now in the emerging peace proposal this is coming up as an important issue. When Saddam Hussain asked for the linkage on 10th August, why did Shri Chandra Shekar, Shri V. C. Shukla and the Government came out with condemning this linkage? Now everybody is supporting this, even some of the U.S. allies are supporting this. It is a matter of deep agony that when the Gulf region was being destroyed, the French Defence Minister resigned, the Italian Admiral resigned, our Government started supporting in so many ways the American imperialism, American aggression. Now this linkage is being supported by several countries belonging to the U.S. allies. Even Egypt, Japan, Italy and several other countries have come out in support of the Soviet peace proposal. This speaks of the strange diplomatic statesmanship and wisdom of our leaders who condemned Iraq for linkage of Palestinian issue. This is how our Government has performed in this war and I do not know they will perform in future also.

Our Government should endeavour for peace. I do not know how long they will last or what endeavour they can make. I do not know whether after getting large sums of money from IMF they will have face or gutts to act independently, but at least the Government of India should take initiative that while everybody is intending Iraq to pull out from Kuwait, at the same time all foreign forces, U.S. and allied forces, should immediately vacate the Arab region, Gulf region. There should be a West Asian Conference to find solution to the problem of West Asia, including the Palestinian problem, without which no solution of the Arab region can be effective. Now, Iraq is being pulverised, Kuwait has been very much destroyed. For the building up of the economy and infrastructure of the two countries, the countries which fought war against them should take the responsibility of financing their rehabilitation. With this I conclude and at the same time, I demand that this Government must go immediately. Otherwise, not only this problem, other problems will also be facing similar situation.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman. It is significant that on the very first working day of this House we are taking up this issue which is exercising the world mind all over

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

The Gulf situation, our leader Shri Shiv Shanker has gone into detail about it. Part of the things I am just going to reiterate in a different way but the other part I am just trying to highlight.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Gulf situation has raised five issues: (1) Peace versus war, the new phase, particularly after the cessation of the cold war. (2) The precept of world politics in a unipolar world-what are the ramifications, what kind of building blocks that are emerging and how the world will have to learn to live with that? (3) The role and effectiveness of the United Nations and the Security Council. The United Nations and the Security Council have gone through a phase where almost everybody was trying to neglect it and the major events were being sorted out outside the United Nations, and suddenly the United Nations has become an active theatre in a radically different form. Then, the fourth issue is, what is happening so far as the NAM is concerned? It was onee a major force, a force whose voice was heard with respect. Its effectiveness on the world scene was very respectable but suddenly something has happened and under this major crisis we seem to be missing in our capacity to use the opportunity. And the last point, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is the issue with regard to the consistency and continuity of the time-tested foreign policy of India,, its current pereception in the world and its current effectiveness in promoting and protecting India's interests.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, facts are very clear that Iraq one fine morning decided to occupy Kuwait. Here is a very embarrassing situation for a non-aligned country where two of them fight out and one ran over the other. Then the United States of America took a particular stand well before the United Nations was seized of the realities. Later the United Nations was brought into the picture and, finally, an endorsement of the Securtity Council gave a go-ahead to the preparations of war under the unified arrangement. The third fact is that in the process of war, the actual agenda of the war operations changer, and changed perceptibly. Rather than seeking a vacation of Kuwait, it almost began looking like decimation of Iraq. At this stage, the possibility of peace has suddenly emerged. There is a silver lining: Depending upon what is the degree of the authenticity behind the press report or radio reports is, there is some possibility.

Now, in that emerging situation, what exactly are the possibilities and what is the extent and the pattern in which we can accelerate the peace process? Mr. Vice-Chairman, with the end of the cold war, the world over a hope had emerged that we will see more peace and progress, much faster disarmament and re-allocation of resources in support of development and peace all over the world. But the Iraqi action in Kuwait created, unexpectedly, a very disturbing situation. it seemed that mankind's hope for peace was premature, that one particular country can take things in its hand and create a very disturbing situation for the rest of the world. We suddenly discovered that a relatively smaller country and a less armed country can be very vulnerable against an ambitious aggressor next door. It also became avident that much of the emotional unity of the Non-Aligned Movement is vulnerable: it can be ruptured by one or two just changing their mind for narrow gains with expediency. But when the Security Council moved into the matter this is the second time—the first time it was the Korean war, by default; Russia was not there it became a United Nations sponsored war. But this time, in a conscious decision, all the veto-holding powers consented to the pursuit of war. Now this showed at least that in the post-cold war period there is a possibility of the meeting of the minds of the parmanent members of the Security Council for some cause. Whether that meeting of minds was possible as a result of a decision to punish an aggressee to

discipline an intransigent nation which was trying to ride rough-shod over its neighbour, which was trying to use its muscle power to the disadvantage of somebody who has less muscle power or it was a consent where an arm-twisting arrangement where the dominant power in the anti-polar world was able to dictate the terms is a matter on which thing, the historians will have to ponder over the details and write in fine lines what exactly the real diagnosis of the pattern and the content of the decision making at the United Nations.

Assuming that it is a war which has been blessed by the United Nations—the consent of the Permanent Members is there it finally became a war under the leadership of one country, paid for by most and contributed for in terms of arms and fighting personnel by many others. In the process it was possible to change the agenda of the war. For strategic reasons if the United States or the allied forces had decided to bomb and bomb in a very decisive way the Iraqi armed forces to reduce their fire power so that they are brought to the negotiating table, one could understand it. Had there been a swift and quick war designed towards quickening the peace process, one could have understood that. But a long-drawn air attack with the mightiest of the technological capability for well over one month is beginning to see the possibility not beginning to see, but almost it is the real possibility that the agenda has irreversibly changed to decimation of Iraq, humiliation of Iraq. The result today is that in almost the entire Muslim world the countries are divided, the Governments being on one side for one set of considerations and the people being on the other side for an entirely different set of considerations. Particularly in the Muslim countries where there is a reign of fundamentalism, where monarchy rules largely, the popular opinion is very much against the monarchies and the ruling parties which are with the fighting forces of the United States and allied powers. The people are with those who are suffering. It has so happened that Saddam Hussein, initially an aggressor, has inadvertently been converted into a hero as a result of the wrong pursuit of the war.

What I am trying to make, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is that perhaps had the agenda of war not changed, peace would have been possible. The suffering of the people of Iraq, the civilian population, men, women and children, could have been averted, and perhaps the humiliation of the Muslim psyche in that particular country in particular and in other countries in the world and a kind of spectro of a different kind of unipolar world being run, could have been avoided. This has not happened. This is one major loss of opportunity for the extension of the world peace process long forward ahead.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to submit that we have been a promoter of the United Nations, and today we are again a Member of the Security Council. India has contributed in many ways in retrieving the losing grip of the United Nations on the world affairs. We did not always succeed. But we tried. Particularly the United States which has been a defaulter not because its capacity to contribute its funds to the United Nation is limited but because it thought that it was a way of punishing the United Nations where it did not subscribe to its views in world affairs, suddenly has discovered that the United Nations is the right forum. Now, does it not raise a question that you use the United Nations forum when you think that it can be pliable and you ignore the United Nations when you think that the things could go against you? So, the re-emergence of the role of the United Nations is a redeeming feature. But in the process its not being able to retrieve its clout is a souhce of worry. We want

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

a rehabilitated United Nations and the Security Council. We also want its effectiveness for the purposes of not promoting the partisan interests of the world community which has created it, which contributes towards its resources and which has a tremendous expectations in the interests of every country. What we find is that President Gorbachev has taken an initiative. I must say the initiative could have been taken much earlier. As we are hearing that President Saddam Hussein has endorsed the 8-point Plan of President Gorbachev both of them deserve to be congratulated first for howsoever belated, but effective initiative from President Gorbachev and for the consent which President Saddam Hussein has given to it. We also take note and take note gratefully that many countries—China, Iran, France and Italy—have endorsed it. It simply shows the world is war-weary already. It wants to see that the peace process is revised. We hope that this body of world opinion will be brought to bear on the other parties also. President Bush, a democrat, caught in a different situation will have the wisdom and maturity to appreciate the concern and the counsel of the world community. We hope that he will respond and there will be an immediate cessation of hostilities. I do not know personally what are the details of the Gorbachev Plan, because the formal list has not come. We hope by this evening everything will be known, but a few things are very clear. Iraq must vacate Kuwait. There is absolutely no compromise on that. It has been a defaulter and it must vacate. The integrity of small and vulnerable countries must be protected with a full force of world public opinion backed by whatever it is. Today it is Kuwait. Tomorrow it could be any other country. We are not going to compromise on that. Iraq has been our friend. So are many other countries. But friendship is one thing and standing on certain principles is aonther thing. Regardless of the cost, we would like to see that even our best of friends appreciate that we do not mince words when it comes to calling a spade a spade so far as their performance in the annexation of Kuwait is concerned. But in the same breath, I would like to submit that whatever the process of enforcing peace or teaching a lesson for aggression, in no circumstance India would like that the territorial integrity of Iraq should be compromised. It is a country proud and resourceful with a long history, a cultural tradition and a role in the Middle East political affairs, a potentially rich country which can revive back; its resources must be kept intect. Its territorial integrity must be protected and its enthusiasm should be retained. It should not be humiliated. Otherwise the world will have to pay a very serious price in terms of other unintended forms of reprisals, which could be a fall-out as a result of a humiliated community. The third thing is no matter what we find about the details of repression, payment or pace of withdrawal or the post-war reconstruction opportunities and who is going to share the booty of that, those details are going to be negotiated and negotiated on a long-drawn agenda, but the immediate requirement from the point of view of the mankind is that there should be cessation of hostilities and both parties must willingly come to a decision to accept that there is no more shooting war from tomorrow, if not from this evening itself.

The fourth thing is that once the cessation of hostilities becomes a fact, or even before that, rigorous steps must be taken with all kinds of ingenuity and imagination to start the building block of peace process. All said and done the history of the Middle East shows that it is always a sensitive part of the world for a variety of reasons. It is resource-rich. Its political instability and international intertests to put fingers in the Gulf pie together have led to a lot of tension incipient and sometimes not so incipient. One after another coun-

tries have been armed and counter-armed and they have fought each other regardless of external help or sometimes with external help. So no matter what kind of peace we have seen, it has always been a fragile peace in the Middle-East. So now when we are trying to think in terms of a grand design for a post-cessation of hostilities, peace plan for the Gulf, better wisdom, more mature wisdom of the world community should be applied so that it is an enduring peace, it gives a longer hope for the people of that region, for the people of the world and for the peace-loving countries like India and other Non-Aligned Movement countries.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to suggest that in the peace process a pre-emptive role should belong to the United Nations. It should not be a peace package worked out between the two powers or the permanent members of the Security Council behind the scenes and then imposed on the world. It should be a peace plan under the genuine auspices of the United Nations where all members, all sections of members have a positive role to contribute. It should emerge as an international consensus and for that a lot has been talked about the world peace conference on Middle-East. Perhaps, a step should be taken to convene that but that does not mean that the other peace process, a sort of a world conference should not start immediately. When I say United Nations, I do not want United Nations in a formal sense. I want the retrieval of the clout of the United Nations as an effective peace-maker in theatres of active war and it should be of a long term duration. If India's role is required in any such form where it can help in implementing the agenda of the United Nations, it should be coming with great enthusiasm with the national support behind the Government decisions to strengthen the hands of the United Nations in enforcing the peace plan, whatever might emerge.

This bring me to the last question, what should have been India's voice and where it has been missing. Let us not forget we have here several ex-External Affairs Ministers sitting here. Vajpayeeji is sitting here. Shiv Shankerji is sitting there. I think in all those periods, India's external affairs have been pursued with great elegance, respectability and constructiveness. The world has always heard us and I am not talking on a partisan basis. Atal Bihar Vajpayeeji was not a Minister of External Affairs of the Congress Government. It was a different Government, not necessarily a very respectable Government but he was a respectable member of that Government. So I would submit that India's record in the pursuit of our foreign policy on a non-partisan basis has been glorious and the world has been grateful for that. In that context come November, 1989, you saw a sea-charge in the world scene regardless of the fact that Vajpayeeji was still a kind of a helping hand in that non-performing Government. But the fact remains that India suddenly evaporated from the world scene. It became clueless and it got involved into an internal strife for expedient reasons, for narrow petty considerations and world politics was edited out of the national agenda and in that process we found some unsavoury happened.

In August, 1990, I think Mr. Dipen Ghosh knows better which Government was in power and who was determining our foreign policy. What happened to the air corridor? Jagesh Desai has been raising his voice to make that point. This incidentally we learnt from one of the ex-External Affairs Ministers. I would not like to name him. That is what happened. He said that there has been an exchange of refuelling facility on a mutully reciprocal basis all over the world and India has been a part of that. But something different has happened in August, 1990. Was it not a compromise in India's foreign policy? Was it not a departure from a

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

consistent and nationally accepted foreign policy? With all respect to the Government which is currently holding charge, when the war started in January, there was one more occasion for course correction. But in their wisdom, regardless of whatever could have been the views of the supporting party, they carried this policy a step forward. It was not only air corridor. It became a corridor and refuelling facility for planes going to participate in the Gulf war. There is a qualitative difference, a qualitative difference with a large margin. And we cannot brush aside this basic difference. And it is there that you find, there was some dissension from the Congress party *vis-a-vis* this Government. (*Interruptions*)

Now, a point is being raised as to what you were doing. You did nothing. You did not even raise a question, with all respect to Gurupadaswamyji. He was a member of the Cabinet. Earlier, in the morning, he said that they refused. There was no occasion. You check your record. I wish to be corrected. There was no occasion for you to refuse anything. There was nothing you would refuse. Whatever was requested, you accepted. So this is... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Please let me say this. Mr. V. P. Singh has already repudiated this criticism. He has said he turned down the request.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: There has been a challenge by Mr. Subramanian Swamy to make that statement on the floor of the House and then face the consequences. He has not done it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Let the records be produced if there are any records.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The simple point I am trying to make is this. Mr. Sukomal Sen and Mr. Dipen Ghosh were shouting hoarse, "What are you doink?" The first question is, "What were you doing in August 1990?" What were you doing in August 1990 when air corridor was given? Were you consulted?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Of all the persons, you are mentioning a witness who is not reliable in this case, Mr. Subramanian Swamy.

...(व्यवधान)...हम को एतराज नहीं है, हमने इतना ही कहा ..(व्यवधान)..

श्री जगेश देसाई : जानने के बाद तो कन्डैम करना चाहिए था।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : और बात हम बाद में करेंगे, हमने इतना ही कहा कि गवाह बड़ा ही अन-रिलाएबल है। उस पर कोई भी विश्वास नहीं करेगा।

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: He is a Cabinet Minister. Are you doing that?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: We cannot do anything. As long as your presence is there, we cannot do anything? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: If it is so correct, then we should condemn that.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I have not said anything about that. I simply said that the witness is most unreliable. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am again repeating. Mr. Vice-Chairman, ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: All the Swamis are mostly there, except one here. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mishraji is very cleverly trying to side-track the issue. The point I am trying to make is, a question was raised by Mr. Dipen Ghosh and Mr. Sukomal Sen, "Why are you supporting this Government?

What were you doing when you found a departure from the policy of the Government of India?" What I am trying to make out is, were you ever consulted when the air corridor was granted?... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir... (*Interruptions*)...

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am not yielding. After having come to know that this was done, did you raise your voice? Even today, are you condemning that? If you are honest, if your integrity is all right, come but and condemn V. P. Singh Government for the decision that they took at that time. Otherwise, your hypocrisy is naked. (*Interruptions*).

Now, coming to what we are doing, we have put a condition to this Government that either refuelling should be stopped or we will have to change our mind. And refuelling has been stopped. So when the time demanded, we showed that we could take a stand *vis-a-vis* a friendly Government also, but so far as you are concerned, you compromise: Compromise on what consideration? Was it spinelessness or was it on some payment? Was it under the table payment or was it a compromise on principle? Whatever it is...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: It is in bad taste ... (*Interruptions*)...

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: You are provoking on facts. .... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: At least I expect the hon. Member to speak reasonably.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I do not see any reason for fighting on this issue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Please conclude, Prof. Thakur.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I will give him the benefit of doubt ...(*Interruptions*)... There is no payment involved, but it was a compromise of principle which is involved... (*Interruptions*)... Sir, I am making my concluding observations.

Our Mnister, Shri Digvijay Singh, a very enthusiastic and young member of the Government, is going to Baghdad as a member of the NAM team. Now people are objectng about the formal rank. It is not the age, is not the formal position, but it is the voice of the nation that you represent, that matters. So we have full faith in the capability of Shri Digvijay Singh.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Is he representing the voice of the nation or of the 54 Members running the Government?

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Of course, he is representing your voice also... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Don't deviate from the main discussion.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: When Shri Digvijay Singh is representing India in the NAM team he represents India and India is with him; whatever points he makes, he represents India... (*Interruptions*)... Don't be narrow in your considerations. Think cooly what I am saying.

SHRI T.A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: I stand by what Mr. Gopalsamy said. It is not the whole country which is with them, it is the Government backed by the Congress and its backseat driving.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The question that arises at the point is that when the team reaches Baghdad, it takes vigorous steps to accelerate the peace process. We also expect that in the peace plan that emerges, we will see that fundamentalism does not retain its upper hand in the Gulf region, that the monarchy alone does not dictate, that the secular

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

and popular forces come up and get a share in decision-making so far as the Gulf countries are concerned. The first thing is that India should ensure that the peace process is firmly and squarely pursued under the effective leadership of the United Nations and in that whatever support the United Nations or its Secretary-General needs, India should offer that. Then the question arises: will it be a comprehensive peace plan or just a limited peace plan? I heartily endorse what Mr. Sukomal Sen said that there should be a large comprehensive peace plan. There is a silver lining there. Even Israel is changing its stance. There have been some feelers, some statements that they are prepared to look at it They are not prepared to link it upwith the Kuwait question, but they are prepared to see what they can do so far as bringing more enduring peace in the Middle-East is concerned. We hope that the United States of America which has a tremendous leverage, does not end its leverage by simply protecting Israel and lending it more money and more arms, but it could be effective in pursuading it to show flexibility of the kind which is required for a comprehensive peace plan to be effective in the Gulf.

Last point. War-ravaged Gulf, Iraq and Kuwait in particular, will require massive international support in goodwill, in relief and in developing reconstruction programmes. We hope that a unanimous agenda for the reconstruction of war-ravaged countries will emerge and that India will un-hesitatingly extend its support and resources in that reconstruction plan. We do hope that peace is still not far away. And we are beginning to see that reversal from the Gulf Crisis to the Gulf being a zone of peace. And peace in the Gulf is a need not necessarily for the Gulf countries only, it is a need also for a country like India which has tremendous economic stakes. We hope that our bilateral relations will be strengthened with the Gulf region, with the big powers and that our image as a peace promoter, developing countries will be restored as a promoter of the interests of the developing countries will be restored with the resurgent pursuit of our foreign policy from now onwards. Thank you.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा में जो भी भाषण हुये हैं, उन्हें मैंने बड़े ध्यान के साथ सुना है। चर्चा का विषय बड़ा गंभीर है। खाड़ी युद्ध को 35 दिन पूरे हो गये हैं, महाभारत की लड़ाई तो 18 दिन में ही खत्म हो गयी थी लेकिन खाड़ी युद्ध के खत्म होने के आसार नहीं दिखायी देते हैं। कुछ शांति प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं, जिनका पूर्व वक्ताओं ने उल्लेख किया है। यह सारा सदन, यह सारा देश आशा करता है कि शांति प्रयत्न सफल होंगे, युद्ध बंद होगा, कुवैत से इराक की सेनाएं हट जायगी और सऊदी अरबिया में जो अमरीका तथा अन्य मित्र देशों की सेनाएं हैं, वह भी अपने-अपने देशों को वापिस चली जाएंगी। लेकिन यह कहना जितना सरल है उतना व्यवहार में लाना सरल नहीं है।

राष्ट्रपति गोर्बाच्योव हम सब के बधाई के अधिकारी हैं। उन्होंने एक पहल की। अगर सोवियत संघ ऐसी पहल सुरक्षा परिषद में करता जब अमरीका और उसके सहयोगी देश सुरक्षा परिषद से इराक के विरुद्ध बल प्रयोग का अधिकार मांग रहे थे, छूट मांग रहे थे, सुरक्षा परिषद के स्थाई सदस्य जिनको निषेधाधिकार है और निषेधाधिकार इसलिये दिया गया था कि एक महाशक्ति युद्ध और शांति के बारे में फैसला न कर सके और तब उस निषेधाधिकार का उपयोग नहीं किया गया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) पीठासीन हुये चायना एबस्टेन कर गया, सोवियत संघ ने बल प्रयोग के बारे में रजामंदी प्रकट करदी। शायद सोवियत रूस ने इसलिये किया कि शीत युद्ध की समाप्ति के बाद पूर्व और पश्चिम के सहयोग का जो नया अध्याय शुरू

हुआ है और जो सारी मानवता के लिए एक शुभ संकेत है, कहीं वह खटाई में न पड़ जाये। हम भी नहीं चाहेंगे कि दुनिया फिर से शीत युद्ध पर वापिस चली जाये। लेकिन हम यह भी नहीं चाहेंगे कि एक देश महाप्रभु के रूप में उभरे और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संस्थाओं पर किसी तरह का अंकुश लगाने में विफल हो जाये।

यह ठीक है जैसा कि अन्य मित्रों ने कहा है कि इराक ने कुवैत पर हमला करके एक दुखद अध्याय शुरू कर दिया है। साल भर पहले दुनिया की तस्वीर बदली हुई नजर आती थी। सोवियत संघ अमरीका में सहयोग, अंगोला में, अफगानिस्तान में, कम्बोजिया में चलने वाले क्षेत्रीय संघर्षों को हल करने की दिशा में प्रगति, नामीबिया की आजादी, इसमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका अदा की थी। गुट निरपेक्ष देशों में, विकासशील देशों में यह आशा जग रही थी कि अब हथियारों के अंबार इकट्ठा करने पर जो विपुल धनराशि खर्च हो रही थी, वह विकास के काम में लगेगी, पिछड़े हुए देशों के भाग्य जगेंगे, एक नई अर्थव्यवस्था के निर्माण में सबका सहयोग मिलेगा लेकिन खाड़ी युद्ध के कारण इस प्रक्रिया को आघात लगा है। मगर हम आशा करते हैं कि खाड़ी युद्ध तत्काल समाप्त होगा और वह प्रक्रिया आगे बढ़ेगी।

यह ठीक है कि अमरिका एक महाप्रभु के रूप में उभरा है, लेकिन सोवियत संघ अगर चाहे तो पहल कर सकता है और उसकी पहल का परिणाम हमें दिखाई दे रहा है। सोवियत संघ की सैनिक शक्ति अक्षुण है। यह ठीक है कि वह आंतरिक संकटों में फंसा हुआ है। जैसे हम फंसे हुए हैं। मैं उसकी चर्चा बाद में करूंगा। इस सारी बहस में बेचारी भारत सरकार को दोषी ठहराया जा रहा है। मैं "बेचारी भारत सरकार" कह रहा हूं। इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि इस सारे संघर्ष में आप गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों की दशा देखिए। अधिकांश विकासशील देश इंटरनेशनल मॉनिटरी फंड पर, विश्व बैंक पर निर्भर हैं। यह एक कड़वी सच्चाई है लेकिन इसके बावजूद अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्नों को गुण दोष के आधार पर निर्धारित करने की अपनी क्षमता का हम पिछले 42 वर्षों तक उपयोग करते रहे हैं। यह नीति संचालन की कुशलता है। लेकिन मैं उसकी चर्चा बाद में करूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इससे तो कोई इंकार नहीं कर सकता कि खाड़ी युद्ध में और ईराक और कुवैत के झगड़े में अगर कोई मुद्दा है तो वह तेल का मुद्दा है। तेल का अर्थ है ऊर्जा और ऊर्जा का अर्थ है समृद्धि। अमरीका सभ्यता ऊर्जा पर खड़ी है, वह तो अमरीका के प्रवक्ता मान रहे हैं। तेल निकलता है मध्य पूर्व से। कुवैत और ईराक, तेल उत्पादन करने वाले बड़े देश हैं और पड़ोसी हैं। भूगोल पर उनकी सीमाएं अलग हैं लेकिन तेल सीमाएं नहीं देखता, वह भूगोल के अंदर इधर से उधर चला जाता है। सद्दाम साहब को शिकायत है कि हमारा तेल चोरी से कुवैत वाले निकाल रहे हैं। उन्हें यह भी शिकायत है कि अमरीका के प्रभाव में आकर कुछ तेल उत्पादक देश तेल का दाम कम कर देते हैं और उसका फल ईराक को भुगतना पड़ता है जो बड़े देशों के इशारे पर नहीं चलना चाहता।

राष्ट्रपति सद्दाम ने एक बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न उठाया था कि पश्चिम के देश यह चाहते हैं कि तेल तो सस्ता मिले लेकिन उनकी टेक्नोलोजी मंहगी खरीदी जाए। वह कैसे हो सकता है ? लेकिन गलती यह हुई कि ईराक, कुवैत से ही भिड़ गया। मगर ईराक अपने पड़ोसियों से भिड़ता रहा है। सन् 1980 में वह ईरान से भिड़ गया था। आपको याद होगा 8 साल वह लड़ाई चली, उसमें 10 लाख लोग मारे गए। ये दोनों ही गुट-निरपेक्ष देश थे। उस समय तो यह सरकार नहीं थी, इससे पहले की सरकार भी नहीं थी, बड़ी शक्तिशाली कूटनीति

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

करने वाली सरकार थी मगर वह सरकार भी ईरान और ईराक के झगड़े को मिटा नहीं सकी। प्रयत्न अवश्य करती रही। प्रयत्न आज होना चाहिए, ईमानदारी से प्रयत्न होना चाहिए लेकिन यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि पहले ही प्रयत्न में सफलता मिल जाए। अब तो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति और भी बदल गई है। अगर हम एक-दूसरे पर दोषारोपण करना चाहें तो कर सकते हैं। उस समय ईराक पर आरोप लगा था कि उसने कैमिकल वैपंस का उपयोग किया है, मगर किसी ने उसको गंभीरता से नहीं लिया। इसकी छानबीन नहीं की।

उपसभापति जी, सीरिया को छोड़कर सारे अरब देश उस समय ईराक के साथ थे। दुनिया के और देशों ने भी ईराक की मदद की। आखिर 10 लाख की सेना ईराक ने बनाई है और इतने हथियार इकट्ठा किए हुए हैं। यह तो मानना पड़ेगा कि ईराक डटा हुआ है खाड़ी देशों के गठबंधन के सामने। हमारे अमरीका मित्र समझते थे कि हवाई जहाज गए, आसमान पर हवाई अड्डा उड़ाए, बम गिराए और ईराक हथियार डाल देगा और हम बाजे बजाते हुए वापस आ जाएंगे, जब वहां उल्टे बाजे बज रहे हैं। हवाई युद्ध में विजय प्राप्त करके कोई देश युद्ध नहीं जीत सकता। युद्ध तो मैदान में लड़ा जाएगा और 8 साल तक ईरान से लड़ने के बाद ईराक ने अपने को युद्ध के लिए तैयार किया है। लेकिन ईराक के पास जो हथियार हैं वह किसने दिए हैं? अमरीका का योगदान है, फ्रांस का है, जर्मनी का है, और देशों के नाम गिनाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। जिन्होंने ईराक को शस्त्र-सज्जित किया था, वही आज ईराक को मिट्टी में मिलाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। उस समय उसे शस्त्र-सज्जित करना भी गलत था और आज ईराक को गोला बारूद के नीचे दफन करने की जो अमानवीय प्रवृत्ति है, वह भी गलत है।

कुवैत खाली होना चाहिए, लेकिन इसके लिए ईराक को नेस्तनाबूद करना जरूरी नहीं है। कितने शक्तिशाली बम गिर रहे हैं। आखिर अमरीका या उसके सहयोगियों के युद्ध के उद्देश्य क्या हैं? परस्पर विरोधी बातें कही जा रही हैं जिनसे सन्देह पैदा होता है। ब्रिटिश डिफेंस सेक्रेटरी ने बी.बी.सी. को इंटरव्यू दिया था, बहुत सार्थक साक्षात्कार है, इसलिए मैं उसका उल्लेख कर रहा हूं, उसको उधृत कर रहा हूं:

"If Saddam and his forces merely withdrew to the border and we do see the liberation of Kuwait, all the Iraqi guns and all the military machines would be poised on the other side of the border merely to repeat the exercise as soon as the allies went away. That would simply not see the achievement of that Resolution. We cannot leave this half-finished with a continuous menace to threaten other States in the area."

कुछ मित्रों ने उल्लेख किया है कि दो देशों में लड़ाई हो रही है, ठीक है, मगर दोनों सभ्य देश हैं। हम 21वीं सदी में जाने वाले हैं। शत्रु के प्रति भी शालीनता की भाषा होनी चाहिए। जब राष्ट्रपति बुश सद्दाम साहब का नाम लेते हैं तो उन्हें राष्ट्रपति नहीं कहते हैं उनके मरने की कामना करते हैं, जैसे बुढ़िया औरतें कहती हैं--मरता क्यों नहीं मुये, मरता क्यों नहीं, मुये, ऐसे कोस रहे हैं। यह अच्छा नहीं है, क्योंकि आज जो युद्ध में खड़ा है वह कल मित्र हो सकता है। यह विश्व शत्रु और मित्रों की बदलती हुई कहानी है।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): This is in politics also.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: आप उनके मित्र हो गए और हम इनके मित्र थे, थोड़ी दूर चले गए। अमरीका समझता था कि थोड़े दिनों में हम युद्ध जीत लेंगे। मुझे सन्तोष है जैसे मैंने कहा कि सारा सदन और सारा देश चाहता है कि कुवैत खाली होना चाहिए, मगर खाली होकर क्या होगा, इस पर मित्र देशों के इरादों

के बारे में मुझे सन्देह है। बधाइयां दी जा रही हैं प्रेसिडेंट गोरबाचोव को, प्रेसीडेंट सद्दाम को, लेकिन ऐसा मौका आना चाहिए कि हम राष्ट्रपति बुश को बधाई दे सकें क्योंकि अगर राष्ट्रपति बुश को बधाई देने की नौबत नहीं आई तो यह समस्या हल नहीं होगी इसलिए युद्ध के जो लक्ष्य हैं उनका पालन हो रहा है या नहीं, यह सैक्युरिटी काउंसिल को देखना चाहिए। ईराक की जिस पैमाने पर बमबारी हो रही है वह सुरक्षा परिषद के प्रस्ताव की सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण करती है। भारत ने अपनी आवाज उठाई है। लेकिन वह आवाज जोर से क्यों नहीं उठा रहे है, इस पर मैं बाद में आऊंगा। और दबाव की जरूरत है हम आशा करते हैं कि चीन के रवैये में भी परिवर्तन होगा चीन बड़ी चतुराई से चल रहा है। कुलकर्णी जी न्यूयार्क में मौजूद थे, हम लोग सुरक्षा परिषद की उस बैठक में मौजूद थे, जब जिस महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव का

4.00 P.M.

उल्लेख किया जा रहा है वह पास किया गया था। चीन दोनों को साधने की कोशिश कर रहा है। अगर महादेश जिन्हें वीटो का अधिकार है, इस तरह से व्यवहार करेंगे तो फिर शांति संकट में पड़ जायेगी। इसमें किसी को आश्चर्य नहीं होना चाहिए। यह ठीक है कि इराक के रवैये में परिवर्तन हो, इराक अपने पड़ोसियों के साथ मित्रता से जीवित रहना सीखे, किसी को 1912 का हवाला देकर यह कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि कुवैत कभी ओटोमन एम्पायर का हिस्सा था या इराक के साथ जुड़ा हुआ था। प्रथम महायुद्ध के बाद जो सीमाएं खिंच गई, उनमें बहुत सी सीमाएं ऐसी हैं जो न्याय-युक्त नहीं हैं। मगर शांति के सर्वोपरि के तकाजे को देखते हुए अगर सीमाओं को भंग करने की कोशिश की गई तो विनाश होगा और उस महाशक्ति को, जो अब एकमेव महाशक्ति है, उसको हस्तक्षेप करने का मौका मिलेगा। इराक से हम लोगों की सबसे बड़ी शिकायत यही है कि उसने ऐसा काम किया कि जिन्हें वह नहीं चाहता था। उन्हें इस भूखण्ड में ले आया। यह ठीक है कि राष्ट्रपति सद्दाम साहब ने कहा कि हम कुवैत से हट जाते हैं मगर इजराइल भी तो हटे। यह बात उठने दो अगस्त को कहो, 12 अगस्त को कहो। इससे उनकी विश्वसनीयता पर थोड़ी सी आंच आयी। क्योंकि उनके मन में सचमुच में उस समय इजरायल अधिकृत क्षेत्र को मुक्त कराना इतना नहीं था जितना कुवैत से अपना हिसाब चुकता करना था। युद्ध के कारण इराक का बहुत विनाश हुआ है। इतनी बड़ी सेना के भरण-पोषण के लिए भी पूंजी चाहिए। उन्हें लगता था कि पड़ोसी देश तेल की चोरी कर रहे हैं और तेल सस्ता करके हमें घाटे में डाल रहा है, उन्होंने कहा इसको सबक सिखाओं। यह सबक बड़ा महंगा है। इस तरह के लोभ का संवरण करना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चंद्रेश्वर प्रसाद नारायण सिंह): सबक अपने लिए भी महंगा है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: कुवैत से इराकी सेना की वापसी और अरब क्षेत्रों से इजराइल की वापसी—है तो अलग-अलग, मगर सम्बद्ध भी है। अगर कुवैत पर इराकी हमले से उत्पन्न समस्या का हल करना है तो दोनों को जोड़ा नहीं जा सकता; अगर उलझना है तो जोड़ा जा सकता है। लेकिन अगर दोनों को हल करना है तो इस बात पर बल दिया जाना चाहिए, इस बहस में दिया गया है और मैं समझता हूं यह दूसरा मुद्दा है जिस पर सारा सदन एक मत है, जिस पर सारा देश एक मत है कि फिलिस्तीनियों के साथ बड़ा अन्याय हुआ है, उनको न्याय मिलना चाहिए; उन्हें रहने के लिए अपना घर मिलना चाहिए। वे दर-बदर की ठोकरें खाते फिर रहे हैं। पश्चिम एशिया पर एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन करके ऐसा समाधान खोजना चाहिए जिसमें इजराइल का भी अस्तित्व बना रहे और वहां स्थायी

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

शांति हो जाए। मैं उनसे सहमत नहीं हूं जो कहते हैं, कि उस सवाल को अभी न छोड़ा जाए। जेनेवा में हम लोग युनाइटेड नेशन जनरल असेम्बली के विशेष अधिवेशन में मौजूद थे जिसमें राष्ट्रपति अराफात आये थे। उन्होंने स्पष्ट कहा था कि इजराइल अगर अपनी सुनिश्चित सीमाओं में रहे और आक्रामक इरादे छोड़ दे तो किसी को विरोध नहीं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि पी०एल०ओ० का आतंकवाद में विश्वास नहीं है, आतंकवाद को उन्होंने परित्याग कर दिया। लेकिन इजराइल के रवैये में परिवर्तन नहीं आया। जो आंकड़े मेरे पास हैं वे तो बड़ी चिन्ता पैदा करने वाले हैं। अधिकृत क्षेत्रों के लोग लड़ रहे हैं इजराइल के खिलाफ, जान पर खेल रहे हैं। आंकड़ों के हिसाब से अभी तक 86 हजार फिलिस्तीनी उस क्षेत्र में घायल हो चुके हैं, 92 हजार गिरफ्तार जेलों में बंद हैं, शिविरों में डाले गये हैं, 4400 लोग मारे गये हैं। जो मारे गये हैं उनमें 40 फीसदी 16 साल से कम उम्र के बच्चे हैं। अगर कोई कहता है और अमेरिका को याद दिलाता है कि आपको सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल के रेजोलूशन की याद आती है कुवैत के बारे में तो इजराइल जो लगातार सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल के प्रस्तावों का उल्लंघन कर रहा है उसके बारे में आप क्यों चुप हैं तो यह एक जायज प्रश्न है, यह प्रश्न उठेगा। लेकिन यह सच है कि आज की स्थिति में इस प्रश्न के उठने को जो ताकत मिलनी चाहिए वह नहीं मिलती है। क्योंकि अमेरिका एक महाध्रुवीकरण करने में सफल हुआ है। अरब देश बंट गये हैं, गुटनिरपेक्ष देश विभाजित हो गये हैं। गुटनिरपेक्ष आन्दोलन का एक संस्थापक सदस्य ईजिप्ट भी था। वह आज अमेरिका के साथ है। सीरिया हमारा अच्छा मित्र है। गुटनिरपेक्ष आन्दोलन में हम मिलकर काम करते रहे हैं। आज सीरिया उधर खड़ा है। इस खाड़ी युद्ध ने ऐसा विभाजन किया है कि शांति की और न्याय की शक्तियों का प्रभाव घटा है। अब अगर दो गुटनिरपेक्ष देश लड़ें तो तीसरा देश क्या करे।

गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति एक विशेष संदर्भ में निर्धारित की गई थी। वह संदर्भ बदला है। बदलते हुए संदर्भों में नीतियों में लचीलापन होना चाहिए। नीतियों में आवश्यक हो तो परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। विदेश नीति का सूत्र यह है कि उसमें परिवर्तन की गुंजाइश होनी चाहिए और उसमें निरन्तरता का तत्व भी होना चाहिए। परिस्थितियों के साथ परिवर्तन हो, मगर कंटीन्यूइटी भी बनी रहे। भारत ने प्रयत्न किये थे। यूगोस्लाव चेयरमैन है, करे क्या? वह अपनी मुसीबत में फंसा है। जिम्बाब्वे की अलग राय है। अल्जीरिया बिना बताए बगदाद चला गया। वह अपने ढंग से कुछ करना चाहता था। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है कि सब लोगों ने अमेरिका जो कुछ कर रहा था उसका आंख मूंदकर समर्थन किया है। अमेरिका के मित्र देशों में भी यह भावना नहीं है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, स्वयं आपने फ्रांस का उल्लेख किया है। यूरोपीय कम्यूनिटी उभर रही है। दोनों जर्मनी एक हो गये हैं। आज नहीं तो कल, यह यूनिपोलर विश्व ज्यादा दिन नहीं रहेगा। आर्थिक शक्तियों के रूप में जापान उभर रहा है, बहुध्रुवी विश्व फिर से तैयार हो सकता है। अगर हम इस संकट में से नहीं निकल सके और अगर इसने तनाव शैथिल्य की प्रक्रिया को पलट दिया तो बहुत मुश्किलें पैदा होंगी। उससे बचने की जरूरत है।

किसी को भी यह स्वीकार करने में कोई संकोच नहीं होगा कि खाड़ी युद्ध में भारत की भूमिका जैसी कारगर होनी चाहिए थी वह नहीं है। लेकिन इसके लिए मैं सरकार को दोष नहीं दे रहा हूं। देश में जो राजनैतिक उथल पुथल हुई है उसका इस पर प्रभाव पड़ा है। हमारी विदेश नीति में निरन्तरता का तत्व हमारी विदेश सेवा से आता है। लेकिन स्पष्ट निर्देश होने चाहिए। नई दिल्ली में राजनैतिक परिवर्तन के कारण अगर स्पष्ट निर्देश नहीं हैं तो अपने अफसरों को दोष

देकर हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी से नहीं बच सकते हैं। भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल के सदस्य के नाते मैं स्वयं न्यूयार्क में था। गुटनिरपेक्ष देश उस समय बहुत कुछ नहीं कर सकते थे, लेकिन जो थोड़ा बहुत कर सकते थे वह भी नहीं कर पाये क्योंकि वे अपने घरेलू मामलों में उलझे हुए थे। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा संस्थानों पर हमारी निर्भरता अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारी स्वतंत्रता को सीमित करती है। इसीलिये हमने स्वराज्य के साथ स्वावलम्बन की बात कही। लेकिन अगर हम परावलम्बी हैं तो उस सीमा तक निर्णय करने की हमारी क्षमता कुंठित है।

हां, यह मैं मानता हूं कि अगर पुरानी से पुरानी सरकार होती तो वह दौड़ धूप करती। प्रतिनिधि मंडल इधर से उधर जाते, मंत्री इधर से उधर जाते, रेस कोर्स रोड पर राजदूतों की भीड़ लग जाती, सवेरे बड़े बड़े समाचार छपते .... (व्यवधान)।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आप अगर एक्सटरनल एफेयर्स मिनिस्टर होते तो क्या करते, वह बताइये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अहलुवालिया जी, आप टोकने लगे, थोड़ा तो सुनिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : उस स्थिति में आपके विचारों का भी आदर होता।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर सफल कूटनीति न होती, तो कम से कम कूटनीति में हम कुछ कर रहे हैं इसका आभास जरूर पैदा किया जाता। लेकिन हमारी यह सरकार यह भी नहीं कर सकी। मगर यह बताइये कि यह सरकार कौन लाया है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : आप लाये हैं। (व्यवधान)...इसका उत्तर आप स्वयं दीजिये कि...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं शिव शंकर जी का बहुत . . .

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : इन्होंने बताया कि वे कूटनीति में परिपक्व हैं। इन्होंने राम के नाम को कूटा है और वही कूट रहे हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं शिव शंकर जी का बहुत आदर करता हूं। वे एक कुशल राजनयिक हैं। विदेश मंत्रालय में भी रहे हैं। लेकिन जिस तरह से उन्होंने ईंधन के सवाल पर विचार प्रकट किए, ईंधन के सवाल पर मतभेद हो सकते हैं, कभी कभी विशेष परिस्थिति में राष्ट्रीय हित क्या है, इसकी व्याख्या के बारे में भी प्रामाणिक मतभेद हो सकते हैं। लेकिन इसके कारण आप यह मांग नहीं कर सकते कि जो पुरानी सरकार या जो वर्तमान प्रधानमंत्री हैं वे माफी मांगें। अगर माफी मांगने का सिलसिला शुरू हो जायेगा शिव शंकर जी, तो यह सिलसिला पता नहीं कहां जाकर रुकेगा। फिर इस सरकार के पहले जो सरकार थी, उसके प्रधानमंत्री भी माफी मांगें जिन्होंने भारत के आसमान को अमरीकी जहाजों के लिए खुला छोड़ दिया था। इस बारे में कब क्या हुआ विदेश मंत्रालय के मंत्री या सरकार का कोई प्रवक्ता सारे तथ्यों को प्रकट करे। ... (व्यवधान) ...अगर गलत है तो मैं अपना आरोप वापस लूंगा और मैं माफी मांग लूंगा। लेकिन इस सवाल पर साफ बातें क्यों नहीं हो रही हैं ? क्षमा कीजिये, मैं कह रहा था कि यह माफी मांगने का सिलसिला यहीं तक नहीं रुकेगा, वी० पी० सिंह सरकार के पहले जो सरकार थी उसने भी अमरीकी युद्धपोतों को, जो एटमी हथियारों से लैस होते थे, भारत...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : यह गलत है।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Peace-time and far-time are different.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं आ रहा हूं।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : अमरीकी युद्धपोतों को कभी भी परिमिट नहीं दिया गया ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं जानता हूं कि युद्धपोत आये थे और ऐटमी हथियारों से लैस होकर आये थे और उन्हें भारतीय बंदरगाह पर रुकने की सुविधा दी गई है । मान लीजिये कि ऐटमी हथियारों को ले जाते वक्त युद्धपोत किसी...

श्री कपिल वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : वे ऐटमी हथियार नहीं थे ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : थे । मैं अपनी जानकारी से बोल रहा हूं । अगर गलत होगा तो मैं माफी मांग लूंगा।.... (व्यवधान)....अगर कोई बात ऐसी है जो आपके लिये मुश्किल पैदा करती है तो आप बोलने नहीं देंगे ?..... (व्यवधान)....नहीं, नहीं, साफ बात होनी चाहिये । अगर ऐटोमिक वेपन्स से लैस किसी युद्धपोत से बंदरगाह में दुर्घटना हो जाय ? हां, यह कहा जा सकता है कि उस समय शांति काल था । यह ठीक बात है कि जब कोरीडोर दिया गया तो उस समय शांति काल था । ...(व्यवधान) ...सुनिये और टोकिये मत।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Mr. Vajpayee, will you allow me? I will throw some light on this.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप बाद में बोलिये।

यह शांति काल तो था लेकिन जब युद्धपोतों को छूट दी गयी तो इराक ईरान के बीच में उस समय युद्ध हो रहा था, लंबा युद्ध था और उस समय अमेरिका की भूमिका इराक को मदद करने की थी । उस समय ये सुविधायें दी गई । उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इसीलिये मैंने उन सुविधाओं को मुद्दा नहीं बनाया क्योंकि जो सरकार होगी, और गवर्नमेंट आफ दि डे, या तो ऐसी सरकार आये नहीं, लेकिन लोकतंत्र में ऐसी सरकार आ सकती है जिसको राष्ट्रीय हितों की अपनी व्याख्या करनी पड़ेगी । मगर जब चंद्रशेखर जी ने इजाजत दी तो मैं उम्मीद करता था कि उन्होंने कांग्रेस मित्रों से बात की होगी ।

श्री पर्वतनेनि उपेन्द्र : की होगी, नहीं तो इतनी हिम्मत कहां से आ गई ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं नहीं जानता ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: How do you know, Mr. Upendra;

SHRI PARAVATHANENI UPENDRA: You deny it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह हो सकता है कि बात की हो या नहीं की हो। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि उन्होंने बात नहीं की । लेकिन मुझे एक बात की शिकायत है, अपने कांग्रेस मित्रों से । क्योंकि यहां पर साफ बातें हो रही हैं तो कुछ बातें साफ हो जायं... (व्यवधान) ... ग्राउंड रेंटल के बिना मामला हल नहीं होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जब यह ईंधन का मामला गर्म हो गया तो प्रधानमंत्री चंद्रशेखर जी ने एक बैठक, सर्वदलीय बैठक बुलाई थी । हमारे इधर बैठे मित्र उसमें नहीं आये । लेकिन भारतीय जनता पार्टी वाले गये थे और कांग्रेस पार्टी वाले गये थे । उसमें यह आपत्ति प्रकट की गई कि ईंधन देना ठीक नहीं है, ईंधन से हमारी छवि बिगड़ रही है । चंद्रशेखर जी ने कहा था कि अगर आप लोगों की ऐसी राय है कि ईंधन न दिया जाय, यह मेरा फैसला था, लेकिन मैं सबकी राय से चलूंगा, आखिर मैं माइनारिटी गवर्नमेंट है तो मैं अपने फैसले को कैसे मनवा सकता हूं । लेकिन मेरी राय में फैसला सही है, उनका ऐसा कहना था । मगर उन्होंने यह संकेत दिया था कि यह निर्णय वापिस ले लिया जाएगा, रिफ्यूलिंग बंद हो जाएगा । इसके बाद भी मेरे मित्र गुलाम नबी आजाद ने एक प्रेस सम्मेलन किया और चन्द्रशेखर सरकार को अल्टीमेटम

दिया कि अगर आप बंद नहीं करेंगे तो हम गिरा देंगे, हम अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करेंगे । यह तो कहना आवश्यक नहीं था । क्या इससे सरकार की छवि नहीं बिगड़ती है ? अगर संकट के समय सरकार की छवि बिगड़ती है तो क्या इससे देश की छवि पर असर नहीं होता ? क्या मित्र एक दूसरे के साथ ऐसे व्यवहार करते हैं ? श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह सरकार से हमारे मतभेद थे लेकिन जब तक हमने समर्थन वापिस नहीं लिया हमने इस तरह की बातें नहीं की ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आशा करता हूं कि खाड़ी युद्ध की तत्काल समाप्ति के लिए भारत अपने प्रयत्नों में तेजी लाएगा । इस संबंध में केवल गुट निरपेक्ष देशों को ही नहीं बल्कि जो विकासशील देश हैं उनको इकट्ठा करेगा । चीन से भी सम्पर्क किया जाना चाहिये तथा सोवियत रूस के प्रयत्नों को ताकत पहुंचाई जानी चाहिये युद्ध बंद होना चाहिये । इसके दूरगामी परिणाम हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर क्या होंगे, अभी हो रहे हैं, इसकी कल्पना करते मन आशंका से भर जाता है । मुझे डर है यह लड़ाई तो तेल पर हो रही है, अगली लड़ाई कहीं पानी पर न हो । पानी के साधनों पर कब्जा करने की एक होड़ लगी हुई है । पीने के लिए साफ पानी उपलब्ध करना मुश्किल हो जाएगा । जिस सभ्यता का हम विकास कर रहे हैं वह प्रकृति का अंधाधुंध दोहन करती है । इस क्षेत्र में, इस भूखंड में सुरक्षा की एक ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये जिसमें जिसमें बड़ी ताकत के हस्तक्षेप की जरुरत न पड़े और न किसी को हस्तक्षेप करने की नौबत आए । अगर सऊदी अरेबिया अमरीका को बुलाएगा और सऊदी अरेबिया इसलिए बुलाएगा कि इराक ने जिस तरह से कुवैत को हजम कर लिया है, ताज्जुब नहीं है अगर इराक की फौजें सऊदी अरेबिया में चली जाएं । तो इस क्षेत्र के देशों की जिम्मेदारी है । लेकिन हम पड़ौसी में हैं, हम दरवाजे से थोड़ी दूर हैं, हम इस दुष्प्रभाव से बच नहीं सकते । इसलिए भविष्य में इस क्षेत्र में जो रक्षा व्यवस्था होने वाली है उस में यूनाइटेड नेशंस का रोल होना चाहिये । उसके बिना बात नहीं बनेगी । लेकिन यूनाइटेड नेशंस की विश्वनीयता पर भी प्रश्नचिन्ह लग गया है और प्रश्नचिन्ह लगाया इराक ने । सेक्रेटरी जनरल युद्ध को टालने के प्रयत्न में बगदाद गये थे । अब उनकी राष्ट्रपति सद्दाम से क्या बात हुई या तो इस संबंध में कोई अधिकृत विज्ञप्ति हो जिसमें बरजेटिम लिखा जाए । अब इराक ने अपनी एक रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित कर दी है । उसमें लगता है कि सेक्रेटरी जनरल ने वहां कुछ कहा, बाहर आ कर कुछ कहा । सचमुच सेक्रेटरी जनरल और इराक दोनों की बातचीत का एक सम्मिलित विवरण प्रकाशित होना चाहिये और जो जेनेवा में बातचीत हुई थी, फारेन सेक्रेटरी बेकर और इराक के विदेश मंत्री श्री तारिक अजीज के बीच में जो सात घंटे तक बात हुई थी, वह क्या बात हुई थी, उसका भी एक विवरण मिलना चाहिये । आज दिन भर हो गया । रेडियो पर सवेरे सुन कर आए हैं कि राष्ट्रपति गोर्बाचेव ने एक बड़ी अच्छी पहल की है, इराक ने उसके अनुकूल प्रतिक्रिया प्रकट की है मगर अभी तक हमें पता नहीं है कि वह आठ मुद्दे क्या हैं । हमें यह भी पता नहीं है कि उस पर अमरीका की क्या प्रक्रिया है । आखिर, इस चर्चा की समाप्ति पर हमें सदन का मत प्रकट करना होगा, हमें शांति के प्रयत्नों में तेजी लाने का आवहान करना होगा और देश की आवाज जो सरकार होगी उसी के माध्यम से गूंजेगी । अब विदेश मंत्री के नाते कौन बगदाद जा रहा है यह विवाद का विषय नहीं है । अब जो सरकार है उसी का मंत्री जाएगा । मगर वह जाएगा तो खाली सरकार का मंत्री हो कर नहीं जाएगा वह भारत का प्रतिनिधि हो कर जाएगा । इसलिए जब वह बोलेगा तो सारे भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हुए बोलेगा और बोलना चाहिये । मुझे विश्वास है, जब रिफ्यूलिंग के बारे में चन्द्रशेखर जी ने फैसला किया तो किसी को यह कहना चाहिए था कि चन्द्रशेखर अमरीका के हाथों बिक गये हैं । अमेरिका में चन्द्रशेखर जी को खरीदने वाला कोई माई का लाल अभी तक पैदा नहीं हुआ

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

है, मैं जानता हूं । नीतियों में मतभेद हो सकते हैं, परसेप्शन्स अलग अलग हो सकते हैं । अमेरिका के साथ भी हमारे मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध होने चाहिएं । क्या यह गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति में बाधक है ? क्या अमरीका हमारा मित्र नहीं होना चाहिए ? क्या अमरीकी नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है ? कि अमरीका की किसी विशेष नीति की आलोचना करें, डटकर करें लेकिन हमारी भाषा ऐसी न हो कि अमेरिका के साथ हमारे सारे मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध टूट जाए और हम अपने लिए इस खाड़ी के युद्ध के कारण नयी समस्याएं पैदा कर लें । इसलिए यथार्थ को ध्यान में रखकर और जिन आदर्शों को नेहरु जी ने निर्धारित किया था उनकी दृष्टि से न ओझल रखते हुए इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हम खाड़ी के संकट को कम करने में पहल करें और घरेलू मामलों में खाड़ी युद्ध को ना आने दें. इतनी कृपा करें । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. (CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I am happy to note that the national consensus is still alive so far as this issue is concerned.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have heard the views of my worthy friends here and appreciate the gravity of the situation. The matter is so serious that this House decided to suspend the Question Hour to discuss this matter, but I am sorry to say that some of my friends here, instead of discussing the basic issues of the grave Gulf crisis, tried to inject our internal politics into it by criticizing the Government or saying that this Government has not done any thing. I think it was not warranted.

Sir, as far as the Gulf war is concerned, everybody in this country and everybody in the world today is worried because the world today has become very small due to scientific progress and the tremendous mobility of man and machine. Anything which is must affect every country and so it affects our country also.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have got two, three facts with me. One is that when the Security Council passed a resolution asking Iraq to vacate Kuwait and to withdraw its forces from that country, the allied forces were there and they were to see that Kuwait was vacated by Iraq. But why did America alone took upon itself the leadership of the allied armed forces? The allied armed forces must have been controlled, must have been ordered, to proceed under the command of the UN and not under the command of the USA. The only trouble is that the USA has been playing the role of a Big Brother. It has also been rightly said that what Saddam has said is right because the USA is indulging in double standards. When it is the question of grabbing of Palestine by Israel, the USA takes one stand but when Iraq grabs Kuwait, it is a different stand. The USA doesn't have any ground to distinguish between the two, as Atalji has very clearly stated. But, even if it is so, Iraq had no right, legal, moral or otherwise, to run over Kuwait and try to digest it. A country may be a very small, its power may be very small. But the big powers have got no right to grab it or to digest it.

Another thing which I would like to point out and which has already been pointed out by my other friends is that it is not only the question of getting Kuwait vacated by Iraq, but it is a bigger question of controlling the oil. I say that if oil is totally controlled by the USA, the economy of all the countries will then be controlled by that country. That is the main thing. That must not be allowed. Our Government, with its own limitations, has been doing it is best. Our Foreign Minister has been going to different countries. Our Permanent Representative at the United Nations has tried very hard. Our Ambassadors and also our Govt.

pains. They have put proposals as early as possible for the solution of this Gulf crisis. So, nobody can say that. The Government might be having any limitations.

Strangely, allegations are now being made against this Government that the refuelling was allowed by this Government. It is wrong. It is not so. The permission was given earlier. There is also an international law. Anchoring of ships, as has been stated by Mr. Vajpayeeji, was allowed during the Congress regime even for those with arms. The V. P. Singh Government allowed overflights. There is a provision that if any country allows overflights, then, it includes landing and refuelling also. These things cannot be separated. How you are blaming this Government, I do not know. My submission is that taking some advantage, some political advantage out of it, is not proper, and we must discuss about it.

I respect Vajpayeeji, and I very much agree with him. We must take the interests of our country into account. Our national interests must be paramount. Today America has started rebuking Pakistan, "don't interfere into the internal affairs of India. Don't help the terrorist." This is an advantage. There is a marked change in its attitude. Even on Kashmir the USA has stated "Nothing doing. On the basis of religion this State cannot be broken away from India." This is a marked change. Are we to continue with the old foreign policy or should the foreign policy be flexible to suit our national interest? That must be our objective, our aim.

We must make our country very strong so that it can be heard outside. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, look at what is happening in our country. In different States we are fighting amongst ourselves. How can you demand respect from other countries? Make yourself strong, make yourself one nation. We have not become one nation even now. This is my submission. We may give lectures here. We may give lectures outside. We may criticise one or the other person. But if we want other nations, other countries should hear us, then, we must make ourselves strong, we must become one nation.

Here I am very sorry to say that even today questions are being raised why Mr. Digvijay Singh is going there. It will be anybody. The country's force is behind him. It will speak, not that of an individual. If Vajpayee Ji went to the Security Council, it was the force of the country behind him which attracted respect and attention, not any individual. We should not come to that level in this House. My submission is, as you have rightly put it, that USA should not try to exploit the situation and the war should be restricted only to the Resolution of the Secruity Council that Kuwait must be vacated by Iraq. That is all. But it is not being done. Today Iraq is being destroyed Its civil population is being bombed. The locations which have got no military sigificance are also being bombarded. That is not the purpose of the Security Council. As I said earlier, the Allied forces must have functioned under the direction and control of the UN, not under the direct control of the US. It could have very serious repercussions later on in future.

Today we have heard that USSR has put forward some very good proposals before the world. Way are those propsals being heard? They are being heard because of that country's power and strength. Even America is afraid that if they do not hear or talk to the USSR and ignore its advice, they can take any decision themselves. They can change the complexion of the war. That is why Mr. Gorbachev's proposals are being taken seriously by everybody. I must join my voice with the voice of other friends who have congratulated Mr.

[Shri Mohinder Singh Lather]

Gorbachev on putting forward these proposals, though belatedly. Even now it is not too late. It is never too late to mend. Even if this war is extinguished and this torture of humanity stops, it will be good for the nation.

Now, see what a nation we are. We are at a very far away place from that place. Instead of rising to the occasion, we have started hoarding diesel and petrol. Can we call ourselves a nation? Suppose somebody attacks us and we are to fight, then what will happen to us? We at least should learn lessons from other countries. As far as the honour and prestige and interests of the country is concerned, when it is there we must rise as a man and not squabble on these petty things, who withdrew from which Government and which Government was strong and which Government committed blunders and what not. I am not brothered about that, I appeal to the House, at least when the country's affairs are there, we must make one voice, That is why I suggest that our Resolution should be very forceful. It must tell USA as well as Iraq that they must stop this fight. It is going to affect the developing countries. All poor countries are suffering. We are not getting the crude oil which we must get from the developing world. I again support Vajpayee Ji, who says huge tonnes of money has been spent on the development of very deadly arms. If that amount had been given to developing countries—not as loans but as grants—other countries would have developed much faster. If only one country develop today, it means nothing in today's world.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Before, Shri Kapil Verma speaks, I would like to say that there is a problem. This item is listed for today and we have far too many names. You are the seventh person, to speak, Mr. Verma. The numbered names are 16 and there are still some names which are not numbered. I think we are heading towards a situation were either some more people will speak, but speak for lesser minutes.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: I will try to finish early.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I am not telling about you.

The second thing is that we extend the discussion by an hour, beyond six this evening. There is one more problem to which the Leader of the House is also alert. Unless the Resolution is passed today, it will have no relevance by the time Mr. Digvijay Singh reaches Baghdad. So he has been discussing with the other Member on the Resolution. In the meantime, you keep this in view and take your time accordingly.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I am telling you about the procedure. Since some parties have already spoken, you give a chance to other parties who have not spoken if you want to have a consensus of opinion on the Resolution. Later on, you can continue with other Members.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I have a suggestion to make. The Prime Minister is yet to reply in the other House, I believe. By the time he comes here, it may be 6.30 P.M. or 7.00 P.M. I do not know. But a number of speakers are there and may be many more would like to speak. It is an important subject. As far as the Resolutin is concerned, it is non-controversial. There are no differences on that. In fact, I would have wished the Resolution was put first and then we discussed on the basis of that. You can introduce a Resolution and adopt it. We can continue with the discussion till Monday also. In views of the latest developments taking place, the American reaction, etc., the Prime Minister can reply on Monday. That would give an opportunity for the Prime Minister also to react to the latest developments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Is that the pleasure of the Leader of the House also?

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think the important thing from the national point of view is that the House adopts a Resolution unanimously today and that is the first priority to my mind. As far as the discussion is concerned, even if it spills over and goes into Monday that perhaps is not a matter of grave concern. But I would suggest at some point of time we should adopt the Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): So we proceed with the discussion with one premise that the last item of this evening's discussion will be the Resolution which will be unanimous Resolution of the House.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Some parties who have not yet expressed their views should be given a chance to speak now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): That does not matter. We are extending the time of the debate.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Somebody is saying that we pass the Resolution first and have the speeches later on.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): The Resolution.....

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Speeches do not depend on the Resolution.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: If the Resolution is nothing, then why to pass it. You say that there should be a consensus of opinion on our foreign policy. Then, allow other parties also to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): We are taking that route. We have enough time.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I think what the Chair has suggested is very good. Lesser time will be consumed by those parties who have already spoken. We will make an honest attempt to reduce the time of the speeches and we will see that all the parties get time. We will cooperate as far as possible. But as Mr. Upendra...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I do not want the Chair to curtail the time of other Members. What I suggest is...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): We will try to see that the parties which have not already contributed should get some priority.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Yes. You please allow them to speak and more Members from the other parties can follow on Monday.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Mr. Vice-Chariman, I am happy that there is a broad agreement in this House on the major issues, major aspects of this problem. This issue has been causing much concern throughout the world for the last several months. For more than a month bombing has been going on and destruction of Iraq also It was a very welcome news this morning on the T.V. and radio that President Gorbachev's offer and plan has received positive response from Iraq. If you allow me, I will read a few sentences from *MIDDAY*:

> "Iraq has agreed to an unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait under an eight-point Soviet peace plan; a Presidential spokesman announced here today. Under the peace plan, Iraq has agreed to begin a full and unconditional pull-out from Kuwait within 48

[Shri Kapil Verma]

hours of the cease-fire. Now, what I am saying is that the initiative taken by Mr. Gorbachev and the positive response from Mr. Saddam Hussein have created a good atmosphere. Mr. Gorbachev has spoken to President Bush on telephone. He talked to him for half an hour. And the President of America has expressed certain concerns and he has said that he will consult his allies, his coalition partners and then the plan will go to the Security Council. In the Security Council, Soviet Union is a permanent member and we hope that the Soviet Union will exercise its influence more in getting this plan approved with necessary modifications. Of course, a lot of negotiations will have to be made and if some kind of a plan emerges with the agreement of President Bush, it will be very good. It will come as a relief to the whole world. But if it does not emerge, Mr. Gorbachev should ultimately assert himself and if necessary, he should use his veto power, which was not used earlier, to ensure that peace returns to Gulf. Sir, it is a good agreement and we should also appeal to President Bush to accept it. The resolution that was passed by the Security Council, Resolution No. 678 only authorised the multinational forces to use necessary force to eject Iraqi forces from Kuwait. It did not call for the destruction of Iraq. But what we find today is that the United Nations importance is reduced. The forces have not gone under the Blue flag of the United Nations, but under American patronage and leadership and they are destroying the whole of Iraq. They are annihilating Iraq which was not the objective of U.N. authorisation. Hospitals, schools, churches, Mosques etc. have been bombed. On television you might have seen children crying. Children are starving. They are thirsty, they are not even getting water. Civilian targets have been attacked. Hundreds of people who were hiding under concrete bunkers have been killed. This was not the purpose, I am sure, of the U.N. resolution. What is happening today is most painful. America is conducting a personalised war against Saddam Hussein; it wants to kill him. I will pay tribute to Saddam that he stood up bravely against the might of the world's biggest power and he has showed that even after one month of cruel bombing, he has not been subdued. That does not however, mean that we approve of Iraq occupying Kuwait. We are against it. He must leave Kuwait and that will be the central point of any agreement. Now, our complaint is that the United States never gave a chance to peace, of compromise, in the very beginning. The report of the Secretary-General and his talks with Saddam Hussein have been leaked out. If true, this shows that Saddam Hussein never closed the doors on talks or on an agreement.

He never said that he was determined to go for war. He, in fact, gave an indication that occupation of Kuwait is not irreversible. Despite this, America was determined to punish Iraq and so it went ahead with the cruel bombing. In fact, the United States is interested in controlling the oil fields and ensuring all the oil suppliers for the future. It wants to control the whole world because of the weakened position of the USSR. As has been mentioned here, the world is moving towards a unipolar world. One super-power is becoming weak because of its internal problems and if President Grbachev gets some courage and asserts on this issue—as has been pointed by respected B.J.P. leader, Mr. Vajpayee, who despite the fact that he is in a party whose policies are different from ours, is quite liberal and when he speaks, he rises above party considerations and he has rich experience in international affairs—what I will say is that President Gorbachev should assert his position. And if he is able to push through this peace plan, he will again occupy the centre-stage in world politics and America's plans of bullying the whole world will fail at least to some extent. President Bush even went to the ex-

tent of threatening that he reserved his right to use nuclear arms if Iraq used chemical arms.

Later on, our party President wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and warned that India will have to review its nuclear policy and will have to turn nuclear capability to nuclear capacity of U.S. used nuclear arms. I am glad to understand and hear from certain sources that President Bush sent a message to Shri Rajiv Gandhi yesterday and said that he was disturbed about his remarks. He assured that he had no plans to use nuclear arms, nuclear weapons, in this war. I hope God will grant wisdom to President Bush. He should understand that he cannot act as an International policeman; as a big brother, he cannot bully the whole world. I am very sorry that the non-aligned movement has been weakened. That has been weakened because of the forces and situation that have been developing in the whole world and that is bound to happen, if its members were divided and one super power weakened, it should have taken the initiative long ago. Our party put pressure and, in my opinion, that is why the Government of India has again started moving into the matter and I hope it will be able to make some contribution to peace efforts. But the non-aligned movement should have done much better and much earlier in this matter.

Sir, I will conclude within a few minutes. On refuelling issue enough has been said. But one thing which has been emphasised here is that—I am not going to read the document that I have because that will take a long time—the basic difference is that if refuelling is allowed during war time to combatant forces, carrying military supplies, that is very different from the arrangements under which in peace time foreign planes are allowed to be refuelled which is the normal courtesy that is extended to every country all over the world. The Government should have suspended refuelling when Gulf war broke out. Now, it is just a closed issue we are happy about that the Government has agreed to our request to drop it and stop refuelling, because that was violation of our foreign policy. But I must reiterate that— I need not read the documents; I have certain papers with me—if the Government has stopped...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Yes, some consultations were there.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Let this House know who has stopped it.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: I am not the Government spokesman.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Then why are you speaking? Let the Government say who has stopped it.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: He has not stopped. He is only a member.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Then you should not say. Let the Government say who stopped it.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: How can you object?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Mishra-ji, wait for the Government's reply.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Government should give the answer. I am not the Government spokesman. In fact, I am criticising the Government for allowing refuelling.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Government of India has stopped at the instance of the Congress Party. Naturally the question is—. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: The Congress Party told this to the Government and said to the Government "you please stop it".

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The decision was left to President Bush. You say that.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Now, you are in contact with President Bush.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Upendra, he must have said about the telephone conversation which was reported in the press that Chandra Shekhar was contacted by President Bush. He must have used it by error.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): This is all beating about the bush. Get on with the job.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: So, what I am trying to say is that the earlier Government, of which Mr. Upendra was a member, in Spetember —I have got the papers here—waived the requirement of technical halts that was necessary earlier for American planes, as a special gesture to United States, with the result that the planes could fly across the Indian skies freely and thus an air corridor for free flying without landing was given to them.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That is previously.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Not previously. No...*(Interruptions)*... In September the whole thing about Gulf war, was already out. It was known that the war was going to take place and preparations had started. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Mr. Upendra, you are no more a Minister. Do not disturb.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA:...and therefore you allowed this. Mr. Upendra, You are always hand in glove with the United States. And so what I am now trying to say is about the ships that was mentioned by Mr. Vajpayee. I have the papers here. Mr. K. B. Lal when he was the Defence Secretary some years ago worked out an arrangement that ships could call at Indian ports on certain conditions and ships were calling as is the custom all over the world. But a separate system was evolved in India that every ship will have to give the guarantee that it is not carrying any atomic weapons, any lethal weapons. That was the position then. So, that is my information according to the papers I have got. I will conclude by expressing the hope that the Resolution which we will be passing as the voice of India, as the voice of Parliament will count in the world counsels and I hope, I will pray to God, that the initiative taken by Mr. Gorbachev succeeds and President Bush agrees to it and he waives his concerns and resvations and an agreement reached and peace returns. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Thank you. Now Dr. Reddy. You will cooperate just as Vermaji has co-operated.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there is a war in which a total destruction of a country is taking place. Never has the world seen such bombing. Almost all the capacity used in the Second World War, all kinds of bombs have been hurled on Iraq in 35 days. There has been carpet-bombing. Nothing has been left and all cities have been bombed. Schools, hospitals, electrical installations, markets, everything, is being continuously bombarded. It is a misinformation that only military targets are being bombed. The entire world knows the truth, that thousands and thousands of women and children are being killed, that there is genocide taking place in Iraq. It has been condemned by the people all over the world. There is no capital city in the world where people have not come out in protest. Even in Washington people are shouting "Stop this war", "We don't want our children to be sacrificed for oil monopoly, for dollars", "We want peace, we want develpment". That is the cry of the people the world over. In India also all democracy-conscious people have marched to the American Embassy; in all the cities the people are demanding peace and immediate cessation of hostilities. When we are discussing this war we must know something about the history which

is behind it. The Middle-East countries, the Gulf countries, have practically the entire crude oil resources of the world. That is why the imperialists want to make use of these resources; they have been making inroads into the power of these Gulf countries in a bid to establish monopoly over the oil resources, so that the oil monoply rules the roost. This is what is happening. The oil policy of America, the biggest imperialist, is aimed at this end. They arm Israel as gendarme to protect their interests. There was a trade war between Iraq and Kuwait over production of oil, for more production of oil. They were trying to bring down the prices so that the economies of these countries, especially of Iraq, after a long war, would suffer. OPEC countries are not able to solve this problem. That is why all their trade, interests, the exploitation of these developing countries, are behind this war. There are people, false prophets, who are saying there is no more imperialism in the world, all the efforts are directed for the development of all, there is no cold war anywhere. Now this has been disproved. We were thinking that now the resources would start flowing from the developed countries to the Third World countries. The Third World countries were so long exploited by the imperialist countries. They were thinking that resources would now flow into their countries, that technology would flow. But all their hopes have been belied now. America did not give a chance for negotiation. This is a fact of history. No package could be discussed whereby all the problems of West Asia could be solved, including the problem of Palestine. It looks as if the problem is one of only oil interests of the developed countries. America was prepared to destroy Iraq, to dismember Iraq, in order to protect its own interests.

5.00 P.M. They are behaving like jackals, wolves, for sharing the spoils of war. This has been their pronounced policy. We have fought imperialism for 200 years. We are anti-imperialists. If this has been the policy of the Government, I cannot understand, how we could succumb to the American pressure, succumb to the American pressure on refuelling.

Finally, it is Mr. Bush who wanted to hide his stripes. It is Mr. Bush who tried to give in, because Mr. Bush knows what the world opinion is what India's opinion is, a country with 85 crores of people, He bowed down. I beg to differ with Mr. Kapil Verma. It is Mr. Bush who bowed down to the public opinion of India because of the anti-imperialist movement in India. It is not the present Government, because they have succumbed to the pressures for IMF loan, for World Bank and for so many other things. They have succumbed. That is why, no party, no nationalist should underestimate the folly of this Government. After all what are the birth-marks of our freedom movement? What is Non-alignment without anti-imperialism? Who are the non-aligend. It is those deprived nations, those exploited nations those who are struggling to stand on their own feet and develop with their own resources, it is these countries who have been non-aligned and the struggle is going on. The contradiction is becoming more and more glaring every day. The false prophets have been saying something else.

[The Vice-Chairman, (Shri Bhaskar Anaji Masodkar) in the Chair]

Are they, the Americans, thinking of a new world order;

"for the new order that the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had pronounced from the floor of the Parliament, a new world order where no State gets exploited by the other States where resources of one State will be used for the development of that State, where

[Dr. G. Vijay Mohan Reddy]

imperialism cannot be allowed to exploit the weaker nations?" This determines our policy of non-alignment and this determines our foreign policy also. Our foreign policy has to serve the national interest. Naturally, we supported all liberation movements in the world, all anti-racist movements in the world, and that is why India plays its own part, which has attracted world attention, which has subdued imperialism not once but so many times. Even in South Africa we were able to beat back the offensive of America. Our policies have been given a go by. Now one ray of hope is there in this world. After millions & millions of people all over the world marched for peace and fight for peace, an opportunity has once more been thrown to the world though Mr. Gorbachev's proposals. If is not that Mr. Gorbachev himself has come out with the proposal. It is the strength of the millions of people of this world which is behind this, which is demanding peace. That is why Mr. Gorbachev's proposals have got the acceptance immediately by all countries of the world except a handful of imperialists, who are isolated, like supported, like Great Britain and the USA. Japan has supported, France has supported, Italy has supported, so many countries have supported. The most populous country and a most progressive country China has supported, that means Asia has supported. Africa has supported, and Europe has supported. That is why, Sir. let us have full confidence in the measures that have to be taken now.

We must support the peace initiatives, taken by the Soviet Union. Also, we must assure the Soviet Union that India will back every measure to defeat the American policy of trying to be a permanent policeman wth its army stationed in the Arab countries. No American army can be allowed to stay in the Middle-East. The American army must get out. Without that there cannot be peace because this is the policy of imperialism and that have to be taken now.

Iraq has to withdraw from Kuwait which it has already agreed to do and everything should be under the aegis of the United Nations. The United Nations must supervise the withdrawal and it must supervise all the measures that have to be taken to see that a settlement is found in respect of all the problems. The most important problem in the Middle-East is the Palestinian homeland and all the problems between the States with regard to the oil interests should be taken up under the aegis of the United Nations and all these matters should be sorted out. This requires the huge mobilisation of people's strength behind these peace initiatives to stop the war so that development of all the third-world countries can take place in a peaceful manner. Thank you, Sir.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सबसे पहले मैं सभापति जी को, माननीय सदस्यों और पार्टियों के नेतागणों को धन्यवाद देता हूं जिन्होंने क्वेश्चन आवर को रोक करके इस विश्व के अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण सवाल पर बहस करने का निर्णय लिया । यह बात बतानी है कि हमारे देश के लोग शांति के लिए, नान-एलायनमेंट के लिए, जहां तक विचारों का ताल्लुक है उसमें बहुत कम शक है । सभी लोग में आम सहमति है कि हमारी नीति शांति की होनी चाहिए, गुटनिरपेक्षता की होनी चाहिए ।

जो प्रश्न अभी उठा है खाड़ी युद्ध का, उसमें सभी जानते हैं कि शुरुआत कुवैत पर हमले से हुई । इस संबंध में राष्ट्र संघ ने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया, और वह प्रस्ताव इतना ही था कि कुवैत को आक्रमण, से खाली करवा दिया जाये। यही उस प्रस्ताव का लक्ष्य था, यही उसकी धुरी थी। लेकिन इसके बाद अमेरिका राष्ट्रपति ने जैसे भाषण देने शुरू किये, वे चिन्ताजनक हैं । पहले उन्होंने कहा कि कुवैत से इराक को आक्रमण को खाली करवाना है । बाद में उन्होंने कहा कि कुवैत को बर्बाद करना है और उसके बाद उन्होंने कहा कि ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी है कि वहां फिर से आगे चलकर ऐसा कुछ न हो , इसलिए

साम्राज्यवादी फौजें वहां रहेंगी, अमेरिकी फौजें वहां रहेंगी । ये बातें स्पष्ट हो करके आने लगीं । जब ये बातें आईं तो ये बातें बहुत तेजी के साथ आने लगीं । इससे स्पष्ट हो गया कि यह जो लड़ाई चल रही है उसका चरित्र बदल गया है। जो उसका चरित्र कुवैत को खाली करवाने का था वह चरित्र समाप्त हो गया और वह चरित्र यह हो गया कि अमेरिका और उसके दूसरे साम्राज्यवादी देश इस क्षेत्र के तेल पर कब्जा करना चाहते हैं। यह एक नई बात आई और इस नई बात के आने के बाद हमारी सरकार को चाहिए था कि इस नई बात को समझती । उसके मुताबिक कदम उठाती । लेकिन यह बात न करके हमारी सरकार ने उल्टे अमेरिका का ही साथ देना शुरू कर दिया हम अमेरिका का साथ देना इसलिये कहते हैं कि हमारी सरकार की तरफ से कभी भी जोरदार आवाज नहीं उठाई गई कि जो राष्ट्रपति बुश बोलते हैं कि इराक को खत्म करना है यह असभ्य काम है, यह जंगली सरकार का काम आज के युग में है, यह उन्होंने कभी नहीं किया। कभी इन्होंने इसका विरोध नहीं किया । इस तरह की जो बातें हो रही हैं उसको सरकार ने संजीदगी से नहीं लिया । इन बातों को लेकर उन्हें विश्व में चारों तरफ जाना चाहिये था और इसके खिलाफ एक वातावरण बनाना चाहिए था । लेकिन सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया । कांग्रेस पार्टी के अध्यक्ष ने इस सवाल को उठाया। श्री शिव शंकर जी ने जो अभी भाषण दिया उसके लिये मैं उनका शुक्रगुजार हूं कि उन्होंने अच्छी अच्छी बातें कही हैं। यह अच्छी बात है । लेकिन उनसे हमारी यह शिकायत है कि जब आपकी पार्टी कहती है कि आपके ही कहने से सरकारी नीति में यह परिवर्तन हुआ, तो इससे यह बात स्पष्ट हो जाती है कि पहले आपने ऐसा नहीं कहा और इसलिये गड़बड़ी हुई

श्री पी० शिव शंकर: मैंने ऐसा नहीं कहा

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आपकी पार्टी के जो प्रेसीडेंट हैं उन्होंने कहा और आप लोगों ने भी वक्तव्य दिया। उसके बाद सरकार कदम संभालने लगी ।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : वह अलग बात है । हमने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि हमारी वजह से उन्होंने किया ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आपके दल के...

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : मैंने यह बात कही थी जब कि कांग्रेस प्रेसीडेंट ने इस बात को कहा कि कुछ नहीं हो रहा है, गल्फ में जो इतनी बड़ी गड़बड़ी हो रही है, तो इसके लिये कुछ किया जाना चाहिये । जब हमने यह कदम उठाया, तब उन्होंने मामले को आगे बढ़ाया । मैंने रीफ्युलिंग की बात नहीं की ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : मैंने भी यही कहा है कि आपने यह कहा कि आपके प्रेसीडेंट ने जब कहा उसके बाद सरकार ने नीति में परिवर्तन किया । यही बात तो हम भी कह रहे थे कि अगर आप पहले ही कह देते तो यह गड़बड़ी भी न होती ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर) मिश्रा जी, आप फिनिश कीजिये ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : अभी मैंने शुरू भी नहीं किया और आप जल्दी फिनिश करने की बात कह रहे हैं । इतनी जल्दी तो अमेरिका भी सद्दाम हुसैन को फिनिश नहीं कर रहा है । अभी तक किसी भी व्यक्ति को रोका नहीं गया । हम अभी खड़े हुए हैं और आप कहते हैं कि फिनिश कीजिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर) आपने ही साल्यूशन निकाला था कि थोड़ा थोड़ा समय सब को दे दीजिये ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : मैंने अभी शुरू ही किया है । मैंने अभी तो शुक्रिया को जाहिर किया है ।

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

महोदय, अब मैं रिफ्यूलिंग की बात करना चाहता हूं । कांग्रेस कहती है कि पिछली सरकार ने ही रिफ्यूलिंग करवाया है । मुझे नहीं मालूम कि तथा क्या है ? हम तो एक रोज भी सरकार में रहे नहीं । अब आप लोग चुपके चुपके मियां-बीवी की तरह क्या बात करते हैं यह हमें मालूम नहीं । अगर कोई दस्तावेज से साबित हो जाय तो मैं उसकी भी निन्दा करूंगा । लेकिन मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि रिफ्यूलिंग दूसरे वक्त और लड़ाई के वक्त में ही तो वह उससे बिल्कुल भिन्न है । हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी कहते हैं कि हम मानवता के आधार पर यह कर रहे हैं । इसमें कौन सी मानवता का आधार है कि यहां पर जहाज तेल भरें और वहां जाकर बम गिरायें । बम गिराने जैसी चीज को अगर वे मानवता कहते हैं तो फिर राक्षसी वृत्ति किसको कहते हैं ? यह आप जरा हमें समझाइये कि यह ह्यूमनेटरियन ग्राउंड है या राक्षसी प्रवृत्ति है । इसलिये हम लोग कहते हैं कि वर्तमान सरकार जो है वह भारत की जनता के लिये और देश के स्वतंत्रता आंदोलन के लि एक कलंक है जिसने इस काम को किया है । शिव शंकर जी ने कहा कि उनको माफी मांगनी चाहिये और हमारे वाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि कितनी माफिय मांगनी जायेंगी इसके लिये मुंशी बहाल कीजिए कि कितनी बार माफी मांगी जायेगी । लेकिन इस घटना से भारत के माथे पर भारी कलंक लगा है, एक कालिमा लगी है । अगर सरकार इसको धोना चाहती है तो वह इससे स्पष्ट ढंग से स्वीकार करे कि हमने यह गलती की है । आप इस सरकार का समर्थन करते हैं आपका भी यह कर्तव्य है, आपने ठीक ही कहा है कि सरकार माफी मांगे और नहीं मांगती है तो फिर आप उनका बिस्तर बंधवा लीजिये, इतनी ही मुझे आपसे कहना है ।

दूसरी बात, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह सवाल उठता है और मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि दुनियां की कम्युनिस्ट सरकार खासकर सोवियत संघ कमजोर पड़ गये हैं । आपको भी मालूम है सोवियत संघ भी कमजोर पड़ गया, पूर्वी यूरोप के देशों में जो समाजवादी व्यवस्था थी वह कोलेप्स कर गई, सभी इस बात को जानते हैं । इतने दिनों तक बहुत लोग ढींग हांकते थे कम्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ जवाहरलाल नेहरू जा रहे हैं, इन्दिरा जी जा रही हैं । बहुत से माननीय सदस्य तो हम लोगों पर आक्षेप करते थे कि यह देश सोवियत संघ की तरफ जा रहा है, वे सही गुटनिरपेक्षता चाहते थे । बहुत से वैसे माननीय सदस्य इधर विपक्ष में भी बैठे हुए हैं, बहुत से लेख हैं, अब समय नहीं है, मैं उद्धृत कर के आपको बता देता । उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अब तो कम्युनिस्ट देश बाधा नहीं हैं । अब जरा जाइये न अमरीका को रोकिये । अब तो किसी से कुछ नहीं होता है । फिर कहते हैं गोर्बाचेव को धन्यवाद देते हैं, गोर्बाचेव का अच्छा प्रोपोजल है । यही बात पहले कहते मैं तो आप लोग गाली देते थे, वैसे इस पक्ष के लोग भी हैं और उस पक्ष के लोग भी हैं । उपेन्द्र, जी नराज नहीं होंगे, उधर के लोग भी हैं जो यह कहते थे कि गवर्नमेंट की फारेन पालिसी टिल्टकर रही है, फारेन पालिसी इधर जा रही है, उधर जा रही है (व्यवधान) अब क्यों नहीं आते हैं सामने लोग आलोचना करते थे भारत सरकार की नीतियों की पिछली कई शताब्दियों में । अगर आप समझ नहीं पा रहे हैं, आप प्रोफेसर हैं प्रोफेसर कनफ्यूस हो जाते हैं क्योंकि आप इंटैलीक्चुअल्ज में भी हैं न (व्यवधान) हमारे देश के इंटेलेक्चुअल लोगों को बीमारी हो गई है यूनी पोलर वर्ल्ड हो गया है । महोदय यूनी पोलर क्या हो गया । पहले एंग्लो अमेरिकों की सत्ता थी, बीच में कम्यूनिष्ट लोगों आव बाधित किया अब बुश बोलता है इसके बाद जौन मेजर बोलता है । अब अमरीकी एग्लों छा गया है । इतना ही फर्क पड़ा है । इससे एक नयी जिम्मेदारी थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज पर आ गई है । सोवियत रूस आपने आपने को सम्भाल सकता है । उनके पास सामरिक शक्ति है अपने देश की हिफाजत वे कर लेंगे । हमारे सामने सवाल यह है कि हम अपने देश के हकों

की हिफाजत कैसे करेंगे ? आज अगर अमरीकी साम्राज्यवादियों का अरब देशों में अड्डा बन जाता है तो हम लोगों पर भी भारी चोट पड़ेगी । अमरीका हम लोगों को सुपर ट्रेड 301 के तहत कई बार थ्रेटेन कर चुका है । जो समस्या उठी हुई है उसको समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए । जिसको आप यूनी पोलर कहते हैं उससे आपके ऊपर, भारत के ऊपर एक और नयी जिम्मेदारी आई है। जो भी सरकार आती है वह कहती है कि कहां से कर्जा लेंगे, जो सरकार आती है कहती है कर्जा कहां से मिलेगा । भीतर भीतर गप कर रहे हैं, आई०एम० एफ० लोन लेंगे, अमरीका से लोन लेंगे जैसे इसके बिना दुनिया चल रही ही नहीं सकती है या देश कोई काम ही नहीं कर सकता है । एक नया एलीमेंट कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि न्यू टेक्नोलोजी को ले कर ऐसा हो रहा है जिसके बिना हम आगे नहीं जा सकते हैं। मैं उन माननीय सदस्यों से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हम बहुत बूढ़े तो नहीं हैं लेकिन हम उस जमाने के हैं जब अंग्रेजी सम्राज्य का सूरज दुनिया में नहीं डूबता था । उस वक्त हम लोगों की सरकार नहीं थी । लेकिन गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में आन्दोलन चला था । देश की आजादी के आन्दोलन में बड़े बड़े नेता लोग थे नेहरू जी थे, सुभाष चन्द्र बोस थे । उस वक्त हम लोग मुकाबला कर सकते थे साम्राज्यवादी ताकतों का तो आज हम क्यों नहीं मुकाबला कर सकते हैं, यह बता दीजिए क्यों हम घुटने टेक नीति अख्तियार करते हैं ? यह लज्जाजनक बात है, डूब मरने वाली बात है कि हमारी नयी पीढ़ी के लोग ऐसा सोचते हैं कि हम अमेरिका की ताबेदारी के बिना हम विकास नहीं कर सकते हैं कौन नहीं जानता हमारे देश में जो कुछ भी विकास हुआ है उससे साईंस और टेक्नालाजी में हमारे देश का दुनिया में तीसरा स्थान है । यह हमने अमरीका वालों से नहीं सीखा, रूस वालों से नहीं सीखते थे, जर्मनी वालों से नहीं सीखते थे। यह सब हमने अपनी शक्ति की बदोलत सीखा है । इसलिए हम अपने देश का निर्माण कर सकते हैं । जितनी जल्दी यह सिद्धांत यूनी पोलर, आई०एम० एफ० लोन और न्यू टैक्नालाजी के आतंक वगैरह से हम स्वतंत्र हो जाएंगे तभी हम अपने देश का निर्माण कर सकते हैं। स्वतंत्र भूमिका अदा कर सकते हैं तब दुनिया के देश भारत की तरफ आकर्षित होंगे । वाजपेयी जी कह रहे थे कुछ मंत्रियों को इधर से उधर घुमायएं क्या फर्क पड़ता है । दिग्विजय जी गए या चपरासी गया भारत का, क्या फर्क पड़ता है (व्यवधान) सुनिए बात को हम इस लिए नहीं कह रहे हैं । आज शाम शोथ ले कर उनको विदेश मंत्री बना दीजिए, तब वे चले जायें । लेकिन डिग्रेड नहीं होना चाहिए भारत के प्रतिनिधित्व को । (व्यवधान)

श्री आरिफ मोहम्मद खान : मिश्रा जी, आप चपरासी मत कहिए, इसको विदाई कीजिए । (व्यवधान)

श्री बसुदेव मिश्र : एम्बेसडर को भेज देंगे तो क्या एक बात हो जाएगी ? ठीक है हम चपरासी शब्द वापिस लेते हैं। आप उनको शोथ दिला दीजिए और फारेन मिनिस्टर बना दीजिए तब भेज दीजिए । जहां सभी देशों के फारेन मिनिस्टर जायेंगे वहां हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर जायेंगे तो वहां डिवेल्यूएशन होगा या नहीं होगा ?

दिग्विजय सिंह साहब हमारे मित्र हैं। आप जानते हैं ही हैं । बहुत नजदीक का संबंध है । हमारा कहना है कि उच्च स्तरीय प्रतिनिधित्व को डिग्रेड मत कीजिए प्रधान मंत्री खुद क्यों नहीं गए । तब तक आप गारंटी दीजिए उनको हटाएगा नहीं तो वे चले जायेंगे । आप ही के ऊपर तो निर्भर है । आप किसी को रहने नहीं देते ।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : मैं आपको एक बात बतलाना चाहता हूं । आपने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही । देखिए आज भी भारत का अस्तित्व ऊंचा ही है । मैं आपको एक खबर देना चाहता हूं कि

[श्री पी० शिवशंकर]

राजीव गांधी जी को गोर्बाचेवक ने और ईरान ने इन्वाइट किया है ताकि सेसेशन आफ होस्टिलिटिज हो और पीसइस्टेब्लिश हो । कल सुबह वे मास्को जा रहे हैं ।

Mr. Gorbachev has asked him to go for that purpose and then he will go to Tehran so that there would be cessation of hostilities and also establishment of peace.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : महोदय, यही मैं शिव शंकर जी से कह रहा था... (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Why do you blame us?

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : भारत की आस्था आज भी है, यही मैं बोल रहा था ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : मैं यही कहना चाहता था शिव शंकर जी कि अगर यही बात है तो यह कठपुतली का नाच क्यों करवा रहे हैं । ये कठपुतलियां आप बैठा देते हैं और ... (व्यवधान)

No that is nt the point. That must be stopped here and now.

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : इन्वाइटेशन अगर वहां भेजा जाए तो खोने में क्या बुरा है

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र क्या तो संपूर्ण कीजिए .. (व्यवधान) जब हमने चपरासी कहा तो आपको बड़ा लग गया, हमने वापस कर लिया । अब यह कठपुतली का नाच क्यों करवा रहे हैं । आपने उन्हें बजट नहीं पेश करने दिया । इनकी क्या प्रतिष्ठा है । न ये बजट पेश कर सकते हैं न आठवीं प्लान पूरा कर सकते हैं ।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : यह बात न कहिए । 140 मैम्बर्स के साथ आप हकूमत चला सकते थे ? आपने कैसे उस वक्त समर्थन किया ? 140 में अगर हुआ तो 54 भी चला सकते हैं । वही बात है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हमने जब प्रधान मंत्री बना दिया था तो अजय भवन में, कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के आफिस में खुश्चेव गोर्बाचेक आदि चिट्ठी नहीं भेजते थे, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को भेजते थे ... (व्यवधान)

श्री माखन लाल फोतेदार : वी० पी० सिंह को इलालहाबाद के बाहर कोई नहीं जानता था इसलिए उनको इन्वाइटेशन नहीं आया । राजीव गांधी को सारी दुनिया जानती है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हम भी आपसे सहमत हैं कि सारी दुनिया जानती है लेकिन सवाल यह उठता है कि चन्द्रशेखर जी को इलाहाबाद में भी परे आदमी नहीं जानते हैं, उन्हीं को आपने प्रधान मंत्री बनाया । आप उन्हीं के लिए कर रहे हैं .... (व्यवधान)

मैं आपसे यही शिकायत कर रहा था अब एक बात और देखिए । सरकार कहती है कि पैलेस्टाइन के सवाल को खाडी-युद्ध से लिंक अप नहीं करना चाहिए । लिंक अप किसने किया ? यू० एन० रिजोल्यूशन के अंदर तो नहीं था । अगर था तो पहले ही था कि पलेस्टाइन को आजादी मिलनी चाहिए । हम लोगों में तो किसी ने लिंक नहीं किया । अब अगर किसी ने लिंक किया है तो अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन के लोगों ने किया है। वे कहते हैं कि हम उस क्षेत्र में सुरक्षा का प्रबंध करेंगे तो इजराइल को शक्तिशाली आक्रमणकारी बना करके और इजराइल को पैट्रियाट मिसाइल या ऐसे हथियार दे दिए । । इस तरह से खतरनाक ढंग से उसको आर्म कर रहे हैं । तब यह देवाल लिंक अप हो गया या नहीं हो गया । पहले यह नहीं था । अब यह लिंक्ड अप है । हम फिर दूसरी लड़ाई नहीं देखना चाहते हैं जो इजराइल या पैलेस्टाइन के मसले पर होगी । लड़ाई में दोनों समस्याओं का निदान होना चाहिए । भारत सरकार को ऐसी नीति का अवलम्बन करना चाहिए कि फिर लड़ाई न हो । इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि फिलिस्तीन का सवाल उस मामले में

लिंक अप हो गया है और उस मामले में प्रधान मंत्री जी हंड्रेड परसेंट इनकरेक्ट हैं । सारी परिस्थिति बदल गयी हैं और वह लिंक अप हो गया है इसलिए पैलेस्टाइन की आजादी का सवाल जुड़ गया है । अब एक प्रश्न उठता है कि लड़ाई के बाद क्या होगा । कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा . . . (समय की घंटी)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN . . (SHRI BHASHKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): How much time will you take?

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : चार पांच मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा ।

You give me five minutes. I want only five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): If the House agrees, after your speech we can take the resolution.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Meghalaya): I would like the Government to consider certain things very seriously. Will they consider Mr. Gorbachev's peace plan before they come out with the resolution?

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: मैं इस बात पर आपसे कह रहा था कि पोस्ट-वार पीरियड में क्या होगा ? कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने सोचा है और हमारी सरकार भी शायद सोच रही है कि पोस्ट-वार वर्ड में अरब कंट्रीज के लोग हार जायेंगे लड़ाई अमरीका का बोल-बाला हो जाएगा और वहां री कंस्ट्रक्शन होगा ।

यहां तक कि अमरीका में जो हमारे एम्बेसेडर हैं, उन्होंने यू० एस० ए० के पास अपील की है कि जो री-कंस्ट्रक्शन होगा अरब वर्ल्ड का, उसमें हमको भी साझी किया जाए, यानी वह समझते हैं कि अमरीका के जरिए-आबिद हुसैन साहब ने लेटर लिखा है और कहा है कि हमको साझीनामा दीजिए । यानी हमारी सरकार सोच रही है कि आने वाला जो युग है; उसमें अरब मुल्क पर अमरीका का कब्जा रहेगा । यह नहीं होने वाला है, आपको फिर हम बता देते हैं । यूनी-पोलर वर्ल्ड, आप और जो कुछ बूझना है, सो बूझ लीजिए । अगर अमरीका ने इराक पर कब्जा करने की कोशिश की, तो पूरे का पूरा अरब वर्ल्ड पैलेस्टाईन बन जाएगा और लगातार भयंकर संघर्ष होते रहेंगे ।

हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि अगर गोर्बाचोव के पीस रिजोल्यूशन को अमरीका ने नहीं माना—मैं आपसे स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूं, तो अब जिंदा लोगों से इस सवाल का हल नहीं होगा । अब मरे लोगों से होगा । जब हजारों की तादाद में लाशें पहुंचेंगी न्यूयार्क इसके बाद वह मरे जिंदों को जगायेंगे और समस्या का निदान होगा ।

इस लिए आप समझ जाइये । अब यह दुनिया पहले वाली नहीं होगी । अब जो बच्चा जन्म लेता है आजादी में, वह मां के पेट में नहीं, जा सकता है साम्राज्यवादियों के पेट में नहीं जा सकता है । इसलिए पूरा अरब क्षेत्र संघर्ष में बदल जाएगा और वह वहां पर नहीं रह सकेंगे ।

इसलिए हमारी मित्रता अरब की जनता से होनी चाहिए । उसमें, सद्दाम हुसैन, यह बात ठीक है कि उन्होंने कई पडोसी देशों पर हमला किया है, कुछ उत्तेजनात्मक काम किया है, यह बात सही है, लेकिन अब भी सेक्युलर है, हम आपको बताना चाहते हैं । दूसरों के मुकाबले में वह सेक्यूलर है, भारत के मित्र हैं और वह अपने यहां चाहें जो भी चाहें, लेकिन वह जो आवाज उठा रहे हैं, वह साम्राज्यवाद विरोधी है ।

यह चीजें ऐसी हैं, जिनको लेकर हमको आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, इस बात को हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं ।

एक बात और हम आपसे बता दें कि जो खतरा उपस्थित हो गया है

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

कि अगर यह बात मानी गई, अगर गोरबचेव के पीस प्रस्ताव जिसके पीछे दुनिया के बहुत राष्ट्र बोल रहे हैं, भले वह काम करें या नहीं करें, तो हम आपको बता देना चाहते हैं कि तब राष्ट्र संघ भी टूट जाएगा। इसका भी कोई महत्व नहीं है, सब समझ में आ जाएगा कि लोग आफ्रो नेशंस की तरह इसकी भी कोई औकात नहीं है, यह साम्राज्यवादियों के कब्जे में चला गया है, कुछ होगा नहीं।

इसलिए आगे आने वाला युग तब अत्यंत ही खतरनाक युग होगा और हम आपसे अपील करेंगे कि हमारी सरकार को चाहिए कि इस परिस्थिति को समझे, भारत के ऊपर जो नई जिम्मेदारी आई है, उसको हमारे नेता लोग समझें, सरकार के मंत्री लोग समझें और जैसे हमारे राष्ट्रीय नेताओं ने उस जमाव में आजादी का आन्दोलन चला करके नेतृत्व किया था, आज एक नई परिस्थिति में जब सारी दुनिया को जरूरत है री कास्ट्रक्शन करने की, टैक्नालोजी की और इंजीनियर्स की तथा डाक्टर्स की, सारी चीजों की, उस जमाने में हमको आगे बढ़कर हिस्सा लेना चाहिए और साम्राज्यवाद की हस्तक्षेप का मुकाबला करना चाहिए। सोवियत वाले क्या कहते हैं, यह उनका काम है, चीन वाले क्या करते हैं यह उनका काम है, लेकिन हमारा अपना जो कर्तव्य है, हम इसी को लेकर के भारत की प्रतिष्ठा को बचा सके हैं और अपनी सरकार के खिलाफ हमारी फिर यही शिकायत है कि आपने इस प्रतिष्ठा को मिट्टी में मिला दिया।

यह सरकार भारत के ऊपर कलंक साबित हो रही है और इसलिए जितना जल्दी आप चले जाएंगे उतना जल्दी सब के लिए कल्याण होगा और जो आपकी सपोर्ट की पार्टी है, उनसे हमको फिर से यही कहना है कि कठपुतली का डांस बंद कीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती मारग्रेट आल्वा जैसा आप लोगों ने किया।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हमने तो नहीं किया। हम तो रोज-रोज नहीं कहते थे कि आप ही ...(व्यवधान) हम बजट पेश नहीं करने देंगे ...(व्यवधान) क्या हमने कभी आकर कहा कि बजट पेश नहीं करने देंगे? आप तो कहते थे।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : आपने कहा है ....(व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : कहा, या नहीं कहा ...(व्यवधान) जब बजट भी पेश नहीं किया, तो यह सरकार रहेगी किस बात के लिए ...(व्यवधान)

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : यह उसकी जिम्मेदारी है कि कांग्रेस की है? ...(व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : कांग्रेस ने ही पीठ पर लिया है, तो जिम्मेदारी किसकी है? जो पीठ पर लेकर चलता है, जिम्मेदारी उसकी है। ...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती मारग्रेट आल्वा : सरकार उसकी है, हमें क्यों कह रहे हैं? ...(व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सुनिए, सुनिए

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You are saying anything that you like. Congress party has supported it. Does it mean that we are to present the Budget?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISRA: Respected Kulkarni Sahib, this what I wanted to tell you that this Government is not capable of presenting the budget before the Parliament and therefore, ... (*Interruptions*) .... This is what I was telling you and you have already spoken about it and I thank you for this.

मैं यह कह रहा था कि समर्थन की बात क्या होती है, समर्थन हमने भी किया था, आप तो जानते हैं विश्वनाथ प्रताप

सिंह गवर्नमेंट का हमने समर्थन किया था । ...(व्यवधान)

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आपने जिसे समर्थन दिया ...(व्यवधान) सारा देश भोग रहा है । सिद्धांतहीन मिश्र जी, आपका समर्थन था । नाथ और साजिश सब आपका खत्म हो गया । इस देश में सत्ता की प्राप्ति के लिए जो पाप आपने किया है वह जनतंत्र के इतिहास में कलंक के रूप में अंकित किया जाएगा ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : यह कलंक अभी केरल में साबित हुआ है जब आप धूल चाटने के लिए चले थे । फिर अगर बोलिएगा तो दूसरी जगह भी मिट्टी चखवा देंगे । वह आपको कह रहे हैं । आप भूल जाइए और इससे सबक सीख लीजिए और नहीं तो फिर वही हाल होगा चारों तरफ, इसलिए जनता की आवाज सुन लीजिए ।

आखिर में आपने जो समय दिया है इसके लिए धन्यवाद देते हैं । इतने ही प्रार्थना करते हैं कि भारतीय प्रतिष्ठा को ऊंचा करने के लिए जल्द से जल्द कदम उठाएं । हमारे डिप्टी फारेन मिनिस्टर को आज ही संध्या पूर्व फारेन मिनिस्टर कैबिनेट बना करके भेजें, यही मैं आपसे अपील करता हूं । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI RAJ MOHAN GANDHI (Uttar Pradesh): We were very happy to learn from Shri Shiv Shanker about the visit the President of the Congress (I) is making tomorrow to international capitals. We would like the Government to inform us whether he is going on behalf of the Government of India?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: No.

SHRI RAJ MOHAN GANDHI: When we ask the Government they should answer .. .. (*Interruptions*)

The second question is related to.. (*Interruptions*) Is he going on behalf of the Government of India? Is he authorised to talk on behalf of the Government and if so, are there two Governments of India and two External Affairs Ministers? ....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, since I gave the information, I would like to bring to your notice that he had been invited in his personal capacity by President Gorbachev and the President of Iran. He is going tomorrow morning to Moscow and from there he will go to Tehran. He does not go on behalf of the Government of India ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We never know about this kind of diplomacy. People have gone there only on behalf of their country. He cannot go there in his individual capacity and speak on behalf of India.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: You are saying that... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: You do not want the restoration of peace in the Gulf ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We have full confidence in the capacity of your President, Shri Rajiv Gandhi ..(*Interruptoins*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I would like to know from Shri Shiv Shanker whether Shri Rajiv Gandhi is visiting Moscow and Teheran would also visit Stockholm... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I will talk for only 5 minutes. If I take more than that, you may kindly stop me. I would like the Government to take these matters seriously. We know generally what are the contours of Mr. Gorvachev's peace proposal. Firstly Iraq will give an undertaking to withdraw from Kuwait unconditionally. This will be followed by a ceasefire. Iraq will start withdrawing two days after the ceasefife. The withdrawal will

[Shri G. G. Swell]

have to be supervised by a United Nations force, drawn from countries that are not involved in the conflict. When two thirds of the withdrawal is completed, all the economic sanctions against Iraq will have to be lifted When the withdrawal is total, all the United Nations Resolutions relating to Iraq have got to be scrapped.

These are the broad contours of President Gorbachev's peace plan. I can understand the anxiety of the Government as well as your anxiety to have this Resolution passed now. I am concluding. I know we are racing against time. The scene in the Gulf is moving towards a finality. Either there is a ground war, or, there is a ceasefire. As of now, we are not sure what the position of the United States of America is. Now, this is where I would like the Leader of the House to listen to me carefully before we go into any Resolution. There is a difference between the beginning of the process of withdrawal as contemplated by the Gorbachev plan and the process of withdrawal as contemplated by the United States of America. If I understand the position of the U.S.A. correctly, they would like the withdrawal to be completed in four days.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: It is not possible

SHRI G. G. SWELL: It is possible. (*Interruptions*) I am coming to that. President Bush has said somewhere that he would like to ensure that all the artillery, heavy artillery, pieces of Iraq in Kuwait wth the capability of firing chemical and becteriological weapons should be left behind. If the proposal is that Saddam Hussein should leave everything in Kuwait and that only his men will withdraw from Kuwait, it is possible that the withdrawal will be completed within four days.

Here, Sir, there are two fundamental questions. One is, whether Saddam Hussein will be able to leave Kuwait with a shred of self-respect which will save him, which will ensure his survival even against his own people? There is so much of destruction, so much of suffering, that it would like another twenty years to reconstruct Baghdad. For the next twenty years, you can write off Baghdad as a military power. Is Saddam Hussein to go from Kuwait with a shred of self-respect? This is what the Americans are interested in.

The second thing which the Americans are interested in is, to ensure that never again, in the forseeable future, Iraq will disturb the peace in the region and, therefore, the destruction of the armaments. Where do we stand? I would ask the Government of India. Can we spell out our position on these two questions? This has got to be clarified.

I now come to my last point. We have the national interest in our mind. I am happy that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is going to meet these leaders. He is going in his capacity is the prominent leader of the biggest Party in Parliament. Let us not spill the beans. Let him go. The whole game of President Gorbachev is to retrieve his position. The Soviet Union has become irrelevant in the whole thing. It is only with his peace proposals that President Gorbachev has retrieved the position of the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union will still have a say in bringing the peace, in sorting out matters after the war. We in India also have become irrelevant I want the Government to answer this question. I want the Leader of this House to answer me this question. (*Interruptions*). Please do not disturb the Leader of the House. I am putting the question to him. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You please address the Chair.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: But he has to listen. I want to know whether it is true or not that our Ambassador in Washington has approached the United States Government with the request

that the United States Government should give us a proper position in the post-war situation.

DR. G. VIJAY MOHAN REDDY: You should come out with the actual position.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: I want an answer, that they should understand the economic losses resulting from the Gulf war, that the United States Government, the American companies should utilise Indian companies as subsidiaries in their reconstruction of Iran and the whole of Iraq and that Indian services and Indian manpower should be utilised for this purpose. Has our Ambassador in Washington made this request or not? If he has made this request, I would like to know whether the Government of India has issued the proper authority to him to do that. And if you have done that, how does this equate with all the noise you are making about refuelling? About refuelling also it is all wishy washy. You said that the Americans themselves have decided not to use your refuelling facilities. Therefore, I want these points to be clarified. Are we interested in the destruction of Saddam Hussain? Are we interested in the destruction of a military machine of Iraq? This is the point which you have to take into consideration and say in so many words. Your Deputy Minister is going to Baghdad. Let him say whether he is interested that the process of withdrawal should begin after a few days or the withdrawal should be completed in four days. That is all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I think the text of the Resolution is not yet ready. All the parties are putting their brains together.

In the meantime, Mrs. Margaret Alva.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it was agreed that at least one speaker from each party should speak before the Resolution is adopted. Additional speakers from the same party would speak on Monday.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: I think we can continue the debate up to 8 or 8.30.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You were not here. It was agreed that one representative from each party would speak today. After that we would adopt the Resolution. Then the discussion would continue on Monday.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Will the Resolution be moved by the Chair or by the Government?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That does not matter much. The Prime Minister would reply on Monday taking into consideration the latest developments. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): By this time the speech would have been over.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): Are we going to adopt the Resolution till all of us have spoken? You first make up your mind one way or the other because this is what was decided. If you want to change your mind, then the change must be for everybody. We have also to speak. Are we going to speak on Monday, or are we going to finish the debate today?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Those remaining speakers can speak on Monday.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I thought the Leader of the House might decide and say what he is planning to do. That is why I was waiting for him. .. (*Interruptions*) ..

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I do not know how many speakers are still left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Seven or eight speakers.

[**The Deputy Chairman** in the Chair.]

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: A little while ago when there were about 16 speakers left, I think the House had reached a consensus, and the consensus was that at a point of time when there is unanimity in regard to the text of the resolution to be adopted, the House shall proceed with the adoption of that resolution unanimously. That is what we had agreed upon. And we had also agreed upon the fact that an effort will be made so that at least one speaker each from all the parties speaks today, and the speakers from the parties which are fielding more then one speaker could continue the debate, if necessary, on Monday: the Government's reply could also be on Monday. That is what we had agreed upon. I suppose this was the position as I understood it. Now, if that is the position, then we go along with that.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam, I was called.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Were you going to speak?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I was on my legs.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Resolution.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The resolution has not yet been moved.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: As a good compromise, the resolution is just being looked into by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Jacob, let us hear what Mr. Salaria is saying.

SHRI SHABBIR AHMAD SALARIA (Jammu and Kashmir): Madam, my submission is that we should be allowed to speak and only after that the resolution should be adopted... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam... ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let me hear one person at a time. I will allow you, but please let me hear what Mr. Salaria is saying.

SHRI SHABBIR AHMAD SALARIA: We should be allowed to speak and, after the Members have spoken, the resolution should be read out to the House and adopted. But the procedure now sought to be adopted is that they will first read out the resolution ... (*Interruptions*)....

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: You say one thing and practise another thing.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, from our party nobody has spoken.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have lots of names before me. अगर सब लोग यहां हांउस में बैठना चाहते हैं तो सब लोग बोलेंगे। उसके बाद ही अगर आप चाह रहे हैं, रिजोल्यूशन पढ़ा जाए।

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: No. ...(*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: On behalf of the DMK nobody has spoken. So I should be allowed. Naturally, I should have been called

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Madam, probably you have not followed what the Leader of the House has said. .. (*Interruptions*). .

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam: my name was also called. ..(*Interruptions*)..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Alva, let us solve this problem first. Your name is called and you will be speaking.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I only started...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Madam, at least one speaker each from the parties which have not spoken must speak before additional speakers are fielded. The Congress Party has already fielded two speakers.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Congress Party has got ten times your number.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Because a decision was taken that Members of those parties who have spoken need not be given another opportunity, Members of parties from which nobody has spoken should be called. That was the understanding.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Others will speak on Monday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yashwant Sinha, may I have your attention? The thing is that Members want that they should also speak, those parties who have not spoken, like some parties who have not been given a chance to speak because their names came later. If they all want to speak, then it will be delayed. Some people want to go early. So, what should be the via media?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: It can be extended up to 7 p.m.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't mind.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Madam, just before you came I was restating the consensus which has been arrived at in this House a little while ago. That consensus was that an effort should be made, as far as possible, to make sure that representatives of political parties which have not participated in the debate should get an opportunity to participate and that there might be a spill-over of the debate which could be carried over to Monday; the Government's reply will also be on Monday, but we shall take an opportunity to unanimously adopt the resolution, which has been seen by leaders of the various political parties. There are some typographical errors which my colleague, Shri Shiv Shanker, and I are trying to correct. The resolution should come from the Chair and adopted unanimously by the House. Now it is entirely up to you, Madam Deputy Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Up to the House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Don't be impatient.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Madam Deputy Chairman, it is up to you to regulate the speakers in such a way that those parties which have not got a chance to express their points of view also get an apportunity to do so.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: D.M.K. should have been called. How was the order changed?

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What is the Resolution?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is getting ready. You did not hear it. He just now said that there were certain mistakes in printing. So, he is correcting it. It will be brought. They are just working on it. So, don't bother about it. That will be ready.

Now I have Mr. Gopalsamy from the DMK Mr. Dinesh Goswami is not here. I have Shri Salaria and Shri Arora. These three parties have not spoken.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: After these three speakers, we will adopt Resolution.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mrs. Alva has already been called. So, she has to speak. (*Interruptions*) Yes, that is what I am saying. She has already been called. So, let her make her submission. Then I will call the three persons. (*Interruptions*) It has to be tied. Now let her speak, please.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I will not speak for long. I just want to place a few points before the House.

One, as far as the foreign policy is concerned, in this country it has generally been a consensus among all political parties irrespective of which Government was in power at various times. We have generally agreed on basic principles. This, unforunately, in the present situation over the last few months seems to have got blurred someway.

The second thing which I want to say is that India has been playing a very dominant and very positive role in the NAM over all these years and has been always in the forefront of initiatives which have been taken at very critical moments both in the United Nations and outside. Unfortunately, since the invasion of Kuwait in August the whole scenario as far as India is concerned, seems to have changed. We were nowhere in the picture. There were some very weak, maybe, statements here and there. But as a nation India seemed to have been pushed into the background, and even at home there seem to have been a certain difference in the perceptions of what was happening in the Middle East.

I would like here to make two or three points which have not been made. One is that the U.N. Resolution that everybody is talking so much about, nowhere mentions about the use of force for vacation of the aggression in Kuwait. We are all agreed that Kuwait has a right to exist and that the aggression must be vacated. But I would call upon the Members to look at the Resolution and see whether the term "use of force" has been used anywhere in that Resolution. The term "use of force" as far as the UN is concerned, has not been used. "All means of diplomatic pressures or otherwise to vacate it by peaceful means" could also be an interpretation. And sanctions had already started.

The second thing which I want to point out is that the statement of the Secretary-General of the U.N. is that this is not a war of the United Nations. He has clarified it and made it very clear that this is not a U.N. war. Under these circumstances, the argument that has been repeatedly made that we are committed to a U.N. Resolution, that we are committed to support this because it happens to be a U.N. Resolution, is something which, I think, has blurred the vision as far as our foreign policy is concerned.

Madam, I do want to say that no country and no group of countries have ever been given the right to turn into policemen as far as the world community is concerned. If there has been any forum where these issues have to be discussed and debated, it is the U.N. We are today in the Security Council. We are a Member of the Security Council. What has been India's intiative? What were we doing? Unfortunately, I have also heard the same thing which my colleague just now mentioned that instead of talking about restoring peace some of our representatives have been talking about getting the gains out of the post-war scenario which would develop in the Middle East. This is something which we must condemn. I do not know on whose authorisation this kind of requests have been made. I would like to point out that what is happening today is something which the civilised world has got to condemn. Withdrawal from Kuwait is one thing, but destroying a whole nation by bombing day and night, the worst kind of bombing that the

world has ever seen on civilian targets, on shelters, on hospitals, on baby milk food production factories. Repeatedly it is being said that their intention is not just getting them out of Kuwait, but to destroy the war machine of Iraq and if possible to destroy Saddam Hussein himself. I do not think that anybody in the United Nations or the Security Council could have subscribed to this interpretation of the vacation of Kuwait. I find that the voice of India even in condemning this has not been as strong as it should have been We have been told that we must look at the world scenario, we must look to our own interests, but, Madam, where the lives of women and children and civilians are concerned, I don't think our national self-interest can get precedence. We have to condmen it no matter what price we have to pay. We are told that the IMF loan was in trouble. So, we have to re-fuel planes. I am not going into that controversy.. Somebody says it was done by the Congress Government and somebody says it was done by....

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Will you yield just for a moment. Let me make it absolutely clear here and now that the re-fuelling of US planes has absolutely nothing to do with the IMF loans. Let there be absolutely no doubt about it.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): There is a press report that Mr. Subramanian Swamy was all the time in Washington to negotiate the loan.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: This is absolutely wrong. Mr. Subramanian Swamy never visited Washington. The IMF loan was not negotiated by Mr. Subramanian Swamy. He had nothing to do with the IMF loan.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: But the Government's softness has been due to getting loans from the IMF.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please don't interrupt. Mrs. Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: We are glad that the refuelling has stopped because in times of war India as a non-aligned country should not be even felt to be participating in any war effort. I congratulate the Government now that this has been stopped.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Madam, why do you continue to re-fuel this Government?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Though belated, it is better than going on all the time. But I do want to say and I have raised this in a forum earlier with our former Foreign Minister, Mr. Shukla. When I asked him, "You consult all political parties on other issues, why could not you consult leaders of political parties on a decision like this?", he turns round and says there was no time. I am surprised that a statement like this could have been made by the Foreign Minister that there was no time to consult. A consensus should have been taken. All the parties could have been consulted on this issue before a decision like this was taken. That is why we also took a stand. But I am glad now, though belated, this has been stopped.

There is this question which I do want to place. It is not just a question of vacation of an agression in Kuwait. The Soviet Union has come with these proposals. Iraq has this evening agreed to withdrawal. But the point is that those who went into Kuwait, the so-called Allied forces have a larger perspective in view. It is not just for Kuwait that they have gone in. It is the oil and natural resources of the Middle East which have got to be controlled by those who believe that might is right

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

and that only if they can have a pliable sort of set-up among the Arab nations, where they can walk in and out, dictate terms, maybe even fix the price of oil to suit their domestic needs, only then will they talk about peace and withdrawal.

Environmental hazards and all the rest that is going on because of this war is something which has to be stopped. As has been mentioned our Party President has been invited by the Soviet President to come and assist in formulating a peace plan in the Middle East. He will be going there. He goes with the goodwill I know of all parties who want peace in the Middle East. Madam, I 6.00 P.M. do want to say let us no politicise the peace efforts. We are passing through a crucial time when answers have got to be found. It is not only in our interest but in the interest of the world and particularly the developing countries. Arms which were released from the involvement in Europe because of the cold war gradually dying out have been now brought into the Third World to be tried, tested and used. It is always a battle fought on the land of others, weaker countries and particularly the developing countries. One hundred and seventy-eight resolutions have been passed on the Palestinian question till today by the United Nations. Why was there no use of force to ensure that the Palestinian people were given back their homeland in spite of 178 resolutions in the United Nations? But one resolution on Kuwait, twenty-eight countries marched in as if the whole of the Middle-East is for them a playground to try out all their tricks and their antigues. It is an economic war that is being fought. It is a war for oil that is being fought and we in the developing world, the Third World have to unite and stand today to face the challenge of neo-colonialism to the developing world and particularly to the Third World countries. We are not going to be bought up with an IMF loan or with any money. Let us stand up for what we have believed, for what India has stood and let the voice of the non-aligned be heard again. We cannot be made irrelevant. We cannot be ignored. I think only if India stands up and realises what the world and particularly the developing world expects from India, the voice of peace, the voice of reason and the voice of the downtrodden and the weak, only then will India be able to rise to the heights which it has held in the past.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri V. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman....

उपसभापति: 6 बज गए हैं ठीक है। जो प्राइवेट मैम्बर बिजनेस था वह सब की रायसे सस्पेंड किया गया, क्वैश्चन आवर भी, सस्पेंड हुआ। अभी तीन पार्टीज रह गई हैं वह बोल लें। आज बिना रेजोलूशन अडाप्ट किए गए अगर एडजोर्न करना चाहते हैं तो आपकी मर्जी है। जैसी हाउस की राय हो।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: आज शुक्रवार है, लोगों को जाना है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was agreed. जो आप लोग सहमति से कहते हैं हम वही करते हैं। Mr. Gopalsamy, may I request you to be brief? You know the mood of the House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, on the strength of our party, 10 Members in the House, equal opportunity and equal treatment should be given to all Members of the party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Equal treatment will be given....Now, let us not waste the time.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The most catastrophic battle has been going on over the past thirty-eight days and blood is flowing on the banks of the Tigris where the ancient civilisation of Sumerians flourished some 4000 years ago. Innocent people, children and women were not spared. I shudder to read some of the reports that women and children were decimated when they were taking shelter in the bunker. The United States along with twenty-seven countries launched the cruellest offensive aganist Baghdad.

Madam, I would like to raise my accusing finger against many countries, including India because they thought within a week Baghdad will be ruined and finished, will be razed to the ground. They were waiting. But Mr. Saddam Hussein stood his ground and once again it has been proved that no power on earth, however mighty it may be, could suppress any race or any country, however small it is. That has been proved once again after Vietnam. I was listening to the speeches made here by many of the Members belonging to the Congress-I. They were shedding crocodile tears and expressing their concern. But I would like to know whether it is a fact or not that a representative of the American Government met the Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar on 5th January. Is it a fact or not that on the same day he met the President of the Congress party? Then the green signal was given to the United States. The refuelling facility was given. It was started from 9th January onwards. And for almost 42 days, you had been permitting war-planes, military aircraft, to get this facility of refuelling and now we have been informed, the country has been informed, that it has been stopped. No, we have not stopped. We have fallen at the feet of the American Government. 'Our Parliament is meeting; we cannot face the Parliament; anger is growing in the minds of the people in this country. Therefore, you kindly do not send the military aircraft to India.' This is the arrangement you have made. You cannot hoodwink the whole nation. Therefore, Madam, Mr. Chandra Shekhar has taken a very casual and callous approach to this burning and sensitive problem. When he was asked questions by pressmen at the Mana airport when he was going to Orissa, Mr. Chandra Shekhar clarified, "We have not stopped. But it is not taking place." And he says, "I only read newspaper headlines to this effect", referring to media reports that the Government had withdrawn the refuelling facilities. Because a news item appeared in the press that the Government of India stopped refuelling facilities, after three days, Mr. Chandra Shekhar is giving his reply to pressmen, "I also only saw the media report". And he says, "It is not taking place." What does he mean? Madam, the former Attorney-General of the United States, Mr. Ramsey Clark, took with him a team. He travelled 3000 kilometres in Iraq from February 2 to 8. And he has given a horrifying report of what is going on in Iraq. I quote:

> "The bombing that has occurred throughout Iraq is the clearest violation of international law and norms of armed conflict including The Hauge and Geneva Conventions and the Nuremberg Charter."

He describes what has happened. The United States has committed war crimes. After travelling a thousand kilometres by road from Jordan to Baghdad, he visited Basra, Najaf, Diwaniya, Hilla, Hasseriya and several small towns. He says that the damage to residential areas and civilian structures, facilities and utilities was extensive everywhere they went. He further says:

> "Every city or town we visited or that was reported to us, had no municipal water, electricity or telephone service. Parts of Baghdad had limited delivery of impure water for an hour a day.

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Potable water for human consumption was the single greatest health need. Tens of thousands are known to suffer diarrohea and stomach disorders. Several thousands are believed to have died."

He also writes:

"We examined the rubble of a Sunni mosque, Al Makal, where a family of 12 had taken sanctuary. The minaret remained standing. The bodies were found under the rubble and identified by a family member who had returned from a military post. The dead included his wife and four young children"

The dead bodies were found in the mosque. Madam, 140 million Muslims are living in this country. They are part and parcel of India. Today is the death anniversary of great Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. We have wounded the psyche of minorities by permitting the American planes to have this refuelling facility at our airports—Bombay, Madras, Agra, Delhi and Nagpur.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: It is not a question of minorities. The whole country is concerned.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Of course, it is. Now you have taken all these steps for political reasons, not on humantarian grounds because the present Prime Minister stated the purpose for which we were giving this refuelling facility. What has he said? "On humanitarian grounds". I don't understand what he means by "humanitarianism". Why does he say "humanitarian"? "Humanitarian" means carnage, "humanitarian" means bloodshed. What for? We have sent our Foreign Minister to Belgrade to degrade the image of India. In Belgrade the image of India has been degraded. I have no personal animosity against Mr. Shukla, but he was a defector, a known defector, a condemand defector; a man who defected not for any convition or cause, but he defected for the purpose of....

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I don't think when the gentleman is not present in this House, such references should be made. It is most unfortunate. It should be avoided. It is the tradition of this House not to refer to somebody who is not present in the House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: A defector is a defector.

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: He is a defector.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The whole world knows he is a defector. What is the purpose of defecting? For getting the plums and loaves of office. ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Please take your seats. I think we are discussing the Gulf situation and not the anti-defection law. So let us confine ourselves to our discussion.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: India is the greatest democracy in the world, but in the comity of nations we have denigrated tht image of India, the dignified image of India and the place of India has been totally destroyed in the commity of nations because he was a defector for the purpose of getting crumbs and loaves of offices. And what happens? They know this Government is only a puppet Government, a * Government, engineered by another group. What a shame; Madam, what I am saying is that at the sight of the Foreign Minister they would have laughed. Inside the country they have totally lost the credibility and they have destroyed the credibility of India in the comity of nations. But here who is the real villain, who is the real villain behind the curtain? I accuse Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. He is solely responsible for permitting the

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

American aircraft to get this refuelling facility here in India. Is he not aware of... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am coming to the point, Madam. Mr. Rajiv Ganhdi is well aware that refuelling facility was permitted since 9th January. For 30 days what was he doing?... (*Interruptions*)...

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri M. A. Baby) in the Chair]

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : अध्यक्ष महोदय को रिस्पांसबिलिटी से काम लेना चाहिए और महज पोलिटिकल फायदे के लिए खाड़ी युद्ध को प्लेटफार्म के रूप में गोपालसामी प्रयोग न करें। Don't mention the name of Rajiv Gandhi. Rajiv Gandhi is the only leader in the world who is bringing peace.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Dr. Pandey, you have not denied this fact that Rajiv Gandhi is aware of what is going on. Are you denying this? Was he not aware? Was he in coma for thirty days?

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: You have a phobia—Rajivji, Rajivji

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. A. BABY): Please come to the point, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am coming to the point. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was aware of what was going on. So he did not interfere. Then suddenly he wakes up one fine morning and he writes a letters. To whom? Even at the slightest nod of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi the Government will fall. At the slightest signal of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi Mr. Chandrashekhar will fall. Everybody knows it. But he is writing letters. Is he enacting the famous balcony scene of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, Romeo and Juliet writing letters? Are they love letters? He could just dial the number of Mr. Chandrashekhar and Mr. Chandrashekhar would immediately respond. When he comes to know there is a telephone call from Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, even if he is in deep sleep, he will immediately jump up and pick up the receiver. It is very easy to contact Mr. Chandrashekhar. I am not accusing Mr. Chandrashekhar. I am accusing Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, that he is running with the hare and hunting with the hound. There is a saying in Tamil: "Pillayayam killi Vittu Thottilaiyum Attuvathu." (*Interruptions*). Therefore, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is solely responsible for this. It is an arrangement between Rajiv Gandhi and American Government. Therefore, what have they done now? The Congress Working Committee has passed a resolution. What resolution? To suspend the refuelling facility. Not to stop, but to suspend. There is a difference between 'suspension and 'stoppage'. It is a very convenient term that has been used. The Congress Working Committee thinks that it can be renewed according to their convenience. They thought it would be over within a fortnight or within ten days. Therefore, suddenly he started writing letters. In that case, Mr. Vice-Chairman, why have they allowed this refuelling facility at all these airports all these days? Finally now they have made arrnagements with Sri Lankan Government. The Foreign Minister of India went to Sri Lanka, to Colombo...

SHR ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We are not discussing Sri Lanka.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is about refuelling facility, I know. The Foreign Minister of India has become the spokesman of the United States..

SHRI M. M. JACOB: We are discussing Gulf.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: According to reliable information the Colombo Government was saying, "We are worried about the war in the north-eastern region..." (*Interruptions*)... knowing the DMK Government would be dismissed an other would a problems. (*Interruptions*) When people are dying in Baghadad, you are giving this facility of refuelling for the military aircraft! Thousands and thousands of litres of petrol was provided for the military aircraft to decimate the population in Baghdad. At the same time, you are publishing the news that ten litres of diesel or fifty litres of diesel some people were trying to smuggle through the Palk Strait into the North-Eastern Province of Sri Lanka. I do not justify ...(*Interruptions*)...any smuggling of diesel or petrol. But, at the same time, I would like to tell that a litre of diesel or a litre of petrol costs more than four hundred rupees in the North-Eastern province. There is no electricity, no water, no kerosene and no diesel. They are now living in utter darkness. Even the wounded and the injured cannot be moved in a vehicle. But you speak of humanitarian grounds for giving the facility of refuelling facility to the military aircraft for the decimation of the population in Baghdad. The people are dying here. I am not talking of the militants. I am talking of the innocent Tamil population. But you are talking of fifty litres of diesel having been found somewhere which was about to be smuggled into Sri Lanka. So, you are helping in the criminal smuggling, not smuggling, but criminal transportation, of feul to Baghdad. This is an unpardonable, unjustifiable, crime you have committed. I am saying this because you are running the Government actually. You have put them in the front, but you, are actually running this Government.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: What were you people doing when Kuwait was annexed by Iraq?.. (*Interruptions*). What were you doing when Kuwait was annexed on 2nd August? ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You touch your conscience and tell, if at all you have got a conscelence.. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. M. JACOB: What were your Government on 2nd August when the hostilities started? ... (*Interruptions*)... Where was your Government at that time?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Had Mr. Rajiv Gandhi decided to stop it, the next moment he would have given instructions to Mr. Chandra Shekhar to stop this. You have played a fraudulent drama in this country to hoodwink the people. Now you are sending Mr. Digvijay Singh, also a *de fecto* Minister or *de jure* Minister there. Mr. Upendra, is he a *de facto* Minister or a *de jure* one? And you are sending him to Moscow also... (*Interruptions*)... expecting that there will be a solution, there will be a cessation of hostilities and then you can go to the people and say. "After all, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi visited Moscow and Teheran and immediately the war stopped." For this purpose they are sending Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Of course, I have great respect for Mr. Digvijay Singh because he is a good friend of mine. But at the sight of Mr. Digvijay Singh the people will laugh and say that aonther representative from the *Government has come there. If at all you want to send some representatives, then send the leaders of the political parties... (*Interruptions*)... because this Government has no mandate just as the United States does not have the mandate to crush Baghdad. There is no mandate from the United Nations... (*Interruptions*)... Even Resolution No. 678 does not give that... (*Interruptions*) And Mr. Rajiv Gandhi will never get a mandate to come and sit in

*Enpunged as ordered by the Chair.

that chair. That also will never happen. So, the real representatives, the leaders of the political parties, should be sent there. Let them be sent here.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: From Tamil Nadu? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: A mortal blow will be dealt to you in Tamil Nadu in the elections. ou will be foolish; already you are foolish..(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VINCENT (Tamil Nadu): The whole of Tamil Nadu is jubilant over the dismissal of the DMK Government...(*Interruptions*)... The whole of Tamil Nadu is jubilant over the dismissal of the DMK Government... (*Interruptions*)... The people are happy there ...(*Interruptions*)... Their rights have been guaranteed and their lives have been protected... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN (Tamil Nadu): In Tamil Nadu, your fate has been sealed... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAL VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Tamil Nadu is on a volcanno now (*Interruptions*)...

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: Your Government was supporting the terorists in Tamil Nadu ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VINCENT: During the coming Tamil Nadu elections you will not get even ten seats. The representatives of the people have been protected, the lives of the Tamils have been guaranteed, Tamil Nadu is safe and the people are free now. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I advise our Tamil Nadu friends to reserve the fire for Monday. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Once again, with all the force under my command, I say that because of the deliberate action of prevailing refuelling facility to the American military aireraft India has committed an unpardonable crime. For that Mr. Chandra Shekhar and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi are solely responsible. They will never be forgiven and that will never be forgotten.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. A. BABY): Mr. Salaria.

SHRI SHABBIR AHMAD SALARIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank you for having afforded me an opportunity to speak on this occasion.

The attack and annexation of Kuwait is one of the factors which led to the present hostilities in the Gulf. But this has to be weighed keeping in view the fact that in the Middle East there have been various Resolutions to vacate the aggression and annexation of the Arab territories by Israel with the help of the United States and the U.K. The result was that those Resolutions of the United Nations were never given any credence, were never put into operation, with the result that Israel continued to occupy Arab territory, Golan Heights and the West Bank. Thus the authority of the United Nations, of the Security Council, and its credence in the world was diminished—so much so that a stage came that Iraq annexed Kuwait and ultimately Iraq said that if the earlier Resolutions with regard to Palestine are honoured they would also vacate Kuwait. At that stage what was the dispute which was left behind? Iraq having agreed to vacate Kuwait, the only question which remains to be decided was whether the United States would agree to withdrawal from the Arab territory which they occupied in the war of 1967 and in the war of 1973. So it was no longer a question of leaving Kuwait, because Iraq made it clear that it was going to leave Kuwait provided the United Nations Resolution calling upon Israel and the United States to withdraw from the Arab territories was honoured. So from that point onwards it was no longer a war with re-

[Shabbir Ahmed Salaria]

gard to Kuwait because Kuwait was offered to be vacated by Iraq. The question only remains whether the Israeli forces would continue to occupy the Arab territories which they had earlier occupied. So the present war, kindly consider, gentlemen, is another war for continued possession, illegal possession and occupation, of Arab territories by Israel.

Sir, the second aspect of the matter is: Can there be peace, a lasting peace, in the Middle East without resolution of the dispute existing there with regard to Palestine when 92,000 Palestinians are in jail, when 86,000 Palestinians have been injured and maimed, when over five thousands Palestinians have been killed, that problem remains. Unless and until an over-all solution of the Middle-East takes place, this problem is not going to be settled for all time to come, and it can erupt at any moment and endanger the world peace. Therefore, it should be the effort of the Government of India that in this crisis which poses a threat to the very existence of the world communiy, to the very existence of peace in the world, we should work and endeavour for a lasting solution in the Middle-East, and not a solution which simply brings about an end of hostility. Then the question arises as to what was the mandate which was given by the United Nations Security Council to the world community with regard to vacating the aggression on Kuwait. It was not a mandate, as the Members have rightly pointed out, to destroy Iraq. But that mandate has been used as a cover, as a camouflage for the purpose of destruction of Iraq. The intentions of the United States are very clear now. The intentions are that Iraq's war machine should be destroyed, Iraq's economy should be destroyed, Iraq's all systems should be destroyed and it should be totally grounded. Such a thing should not be allowed to be done by the United Nations in a third world country. There should have been a hue and cry, there should have been a spontaneous reaction from a country like India when this has started. But, on the other hand—we are dismayed to find—what was done was that we offered refuelling facilities to a nation, to a country which was directly involved in the war, to its war-planes. And then we have the audacity to say that we are a Non-aligned nation. The very day we did so the myth of our non-alignment was exploded. And it became clear to the world that we are no longer a non-aligned country. Even if we are a non-aligned country, our status as such is now gravely doubtful in the estimation of the family of nations. And this mistake that has been committed and which has been pointed out by the hon. Mebers herewould show that in future it will take a long time for those who love India, for those who want to love India, to re-establish that status, that authority, that credence for the people of India which we have built up so assiduously in the past. And the United Nations Organisation has also been brought to therefore of the world community as an orgnisation which is now weaker than the League of Nations was at the time when the Second World War started. It is a body which is how unable to stop war; it is a body which is unable to bring about peace; it is a body which is unable to give any succour to the suffering humanity, to the suffering people of the world. On the other hand, it has become a handmaid of America, an organisation in which the people have lost faith. This bodes ill in the days to come. And India must work for the reform of this institution so that in future the United Nations is not treated as a body merely for the purpose of talking merely for the purpose of acting on the behest of the United States or any other country. Now, the world scenario has changed with the USSR going into background for its internal reasons. But nevertheless, if the countries which are non-aligned work together, if they pool their energies together, I feel that they can work together and bring about a solid confrontantion against imperialist forces.

The new plan that has been put forth is welcome. And this opportunity should be seized, and our country should go ahead to see that this plan is given a chance and war is stopped. Notwithstanding the fact that this plan clearly offers withdrawl of the forces from Kuwait, the US continues to bombard Iraq continues to bombard the civilians, continues to bombard air-raid shelters, continues to combard water supply facilities, continues to bombard civilian targets, goes to show that their intentions are bad and *mala fide*. They want to have a control over the nation's resources, and the oil wealth of Arab countries, because those are the countries that are divided, because those are the countries which are unable to defend themselves. Under the circumstances we have to see how best we can safeguard the interest of those countries. Today it is Iraq; tomorrow it will be some other country; third day it may be our country. We are also in the Third World and they will not spare us if they get a chance to do some wrong to us. Today they may be satisfied in subduing the Government of India and in shaping the policy of India by other means, through IMF loans or by other methods which they have in their hands, but tomorrow they may take to other methods. India has, for its own sake, to work for the purpose of bringing peace, for the purpose of establishment of a strong United Nations and for bringing together all the non-aligned nations so that the hegemony which America is trying to create, so that destruction that America is going to wreak on the rest of the world, is checked so that honour and respect for the people is restored so that poor people in poorer countries are not killed in the manner in which they have been killed.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

So that the war ends and peace comes for which we pray to Almighty God, it should be our effort to help them to re-build, to give them a helping hand and to see that in that area no further war takes place. As I submitted, the only guarantee for establishment of peace in the Middle East lies in the soution of the Palestinian question, and that there should be a United Nations not of the present type, but United Nations which is able to command respect, which will be a non-partisan body, which will not be a handmaid of any particular nation and which will not be made to act on a particular nation's stance. We would like to have that type of United Nations. Unless that happens, the world will remain in turmoil and the future of the world will be in danger.

I may also like to submit before this hon. House that the manner in which refuelling facility was given by us and the manner in which we acted, has tarnished our image. Yet, hopes are not lost. It is time that we rise from this deep slumber and instead of talking about our internal bickerings, our internal differences, we should pool our efforts together and see that the war is ended and that in future, Middle East lives in peace along with the rest of the world. Thank you.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: The Gulf war or the Gulf crisis which has resulted in an open war, I consider, is a dishonest war. It was not necessary to have gone to war to solve the problem. But there is no doubt that when people get power-drunk, they do certain acts which results in war. There is no doubt that President Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait was illegal and uncalled for. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein after fighting an 8-year war with Iran realised that it was the super power which made them fight with each other so that there is no dominant power left in the Middle East which is so vital to the Western nations, especially to America. So he decided that he has to be a dominant power in the Middle East if he was to be in a position to control the very valuable raw materials, that is crude oil. He

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

could not do it because, Saudi Arabia, which has the major share of the oil resource, is the handmaid of America. I think this is what prompted him to go and occupy Kuwait which would eventually enable him to achieve his aim of making Iraq the most dominant power in the region, little realising that the Americans' vital interests were affected. America, which had been supporting Iraq for a number of years in order to cut down the strength of Iran, decided now to finish Iraq once and for all.

You will notice that right from the beginning President Bush started talking about Saddam Hussein in many derogatory terms, like Hitler, etc., realising that being an Arab, such insults to him would make him take umbrage and become unbending in achieving anything which could be done across the table. He was not ready to sit across the table. Now that the war is on, it must be quite clear to us that the aim of America is to destroy Iraq and destroy Saddam Hussein. Anything short of it is not going to satisfy America.

Another thing is, having learnt their lesson in Indo-China, when they were fighting the Viet Cong, while North Korea was untouched, here, the Americans want to go for the jugular; they want to go for Iraq. It is only the destruction of Iraq which could bring about the realisation of the immediate objective, namely, the vacation of Kuwait by Iraq, as well as the realisation of the ultimate objective of having total dominance over the Middle-East.

Keeping these things in our mind, if we say that the Americans are killing civilians, destroying water supply installations, medical facilities, etc., I think we are unnecessarily getting worked up about it. We must realise that America is doing this deliberately. I still have my doubts whether the initiative taken by Russia, which had been welcomed and which deserves to be welcomed, would bear fruits. We do not know whether America is going to accept the plan, or, it is going to impose very stiff conditions. I say this because, the Americans want Saddam Hussein to go back as a defeated person with the tail between his legs, so that he may not become powerful again.

Another thing that arises out of this is, whether we like it or not, it is a unipolar world today. Therefore, the non-aligned movement has lost much of its moral authority now. If Russia had not broken away from the coalition and taken an independent stand, I do not think the non-aligned movement would have been able to play any role. In the changed circumstances, we must consider as to what should be our foreign policy. We cannot say that non-alignment, which has become a holy cow, is the only policy we can think of. It is a new world which is emerging and, therefore, we have got to think afresh. It will be necessary for us to put our heads together and do it.

There is no doubt that in the last few years, because of our internal bickerings, because of our inability to solve our own problems, the image of India has definitely diminished among the comity of nations. It is only through internal strength that a country can play a useful role in the international field. Until we are able to resolve that, for us to retain the leadership of the developing countries is not going to be easy. I have no doubt that if China had not supported Russia and if Iraq had not supported. Russia, our support would not have mattered so much. So, we have got to be realistic about it. We must consider in depth how we are going to become the leaders again and that can only be through internal strength.

I am very happy to know that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has been invited by Russia and Iran to go there to take part in parleys. But there is no doubt that it diminishes the present Government in power. If that is the aim or, I should say, it also really brings out that the people who understand the international world also know where

the power lies. So, why are we going through a sham of having a Government which not only finds it difficult to work day by day, not knowing when the rug is going to be pulled away from their feet. Even the outside world believe that they must talk in depth to Rajiv Gandhi who, of course, is the president of the biggest party, rather than talking to somebody in the Government which is of little consequence. This has to be put right.

Finally there is one other aspect that I feel we have got to take into consideration and that is,if we are not going to be steam-rolled by the United States of America, how are we going to form ourselves into a group and which group it is going to be the one with which we should align ourselves? I think we should realise that it is the developing nations group which is going to be suitable for us because it is the developing nations who are going to find it extremely difficult to stand up to the pressures that would be exercised not only by America but also by other developed Western nations.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I have a suggestion. I suggest that there should a call for sending relief, medicines, baby food and other necessities to war-torn Iraq as a gesture of our sympathy and solidarity with the people of that countrp. Even we can also send a medical team. This will be consistent with the tradition of our great country and I believe it is not only passing of a Resolution but alongwith it some material help should be given to that country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a good suggestion. I hope everybody in the country will take note of it. Now let me read out the Resolution.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What is the response of the Government?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The Chair has already responded on behalf of all of us and I thought it was not necessary to respond. I think the sentiments which have been expressed by my friend Gurudas Das Gupta are noble sentiments. The Government of India is already sending relief supplies to Iraq and will continue to do it. We will increase the quantity and the extent.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What about the initiative for mobilising more and more...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that should be the job of the people like us, Members of Parliament, and the people of this country. Each one of us should mobilise whatever help we can give.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: If some private organisation wants to send some relief, how can it be done?

श्री शारदा महंती : (उड़ीसा) महोदया, रिजोल्यूशन की कापी हम लोगों को भी मिलनी चाहिये।

उपसभापति : उसकी कापियां नहीं बनी हैं। अभी हम पढ़ेंगे। आपको कापी बाद में दे देंगे।

"Aware of the incalculable human suffering caused by the war in the Gulf, the danger it poses to the environment in the region and to international peace and security;

Deeply distressed at the devastation unleashed by the war resulting in the loss of many innocent lives and heroic civilians being subjected to avoidable misery, suffering and deprivatios where men, women, children and infants are without shelter or protection facing unprecedented health hazards due to the absence of even basic human necessities;

Convinced that the implementation of the Security Council resolutions constitutes the basis for restoring peace in the Gulf;

Convinced also of the central role of the UN, when appropriate, through the Security Council in bringing about cessation of hostilities and restoring and promoting durable peace and security in the region;

Stressing that the objective of the Security Council resolutions is to libe-

rate Kuwait and not to subdue Iraq or to dismantle its technological and physical infrastructure or to cripple its social and economic life;

Gravely concerned by the possibility of the commencement of an even more destructive phase in the conflict that can result from a ground war;

Noting the statements made by some parties engaged in the Gulf war about the possible use of nuclear and chemical weapons;

Recognizing the role of the Non-Aligned Movement in promoting a peaceful solution and the need for affirmative and prompt action in this regard;

Heartened by the reports that an Eight-Point Peace Plan proposed by President Gorbachev has been accepted by President Saddam Hussein;

Gratified to note that the Peace Plan is very much in line with India's own peace proposal submitted at the NAM meeting in Belgrade;

Convinced that the war must be stopped immediately and peace restored in West Asia;

"This House—

(1) Urges the Government of India to exert all efforts in the Security Council to mobilize global support for the acceptance of the Gorbachev Proposals to bring an end to the West Asian War and work for sustained peace in the region;

(2) Further urges the multinational forces led by the United States to desist from launching a land offensive pending efforts and negotiations being currently undertaken in regard to the Gorbachev Proposals and calls for a pause in the air attacks and sea offensive on both the sides;

(3) Urges that agreement should also be reached in the Security Council to address in a comprehensive manner, after the completion of the process of withdrawal of foreign forces, the Arab-Israeli conflict particularly the Palestinian question, based on the relevant UN Security Council resolutions on this subject and with the participation of the PLO; and

(4) Considers that any regional security arrangement in the area should emrge from the initiative of the regional countries themselves, and be worked out under the overall aegis of the United Nations, guaranted by the Security Council and the UN Peace-Keeping Force, underpinned by disarmanment measures which are universal in character."

I hope the House passes the Resolution unanimously.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Yes.

The Resolution was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, all those Members of Parliament who could not get an opportunity to speak today will speak on Monday. The House is adjourned till 11 o'clock on Monday.

The House then adjourned at fifty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 25th February, 1991.